



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2010

No. 28

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

DUAL PROCUREMENT OF TANKERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today to talk about what I think is the most important issue in America, and that is jobs, specifically something that this administration can do quickly to help alleviate our jobs problem. Many people in this country recognize that there has been a debate in Congress for the last few years about how to replace our aging tanker fleet in the Air Force. We have tankers that are over 50 years old and need to be replaced now. We have had a competition for the contract to replace those tankers ongoing for years that has been nothing but bureaucratic.

What I would like to urge the President to do is instruct his Defense Department to consider something that our late colleague Mr. Murtha supported, and that was dual procurement of these tankers. We can take the two major prime contractors, Boeing and Northrop Grumman, and allow both of them to proceed with tanker production to do a couple things: One, to immediately have an injection of jobs into the country, a bigger injection than we would have had by sole source procurement, but also we would more rapidly then get the fleet of tankers replaced.

Under the current construct, it would take 40 years. I don't think anybody

wants the warfighter to be having to fly 80- and 90-year-old tankers. I understand that the Air Force would need its procurement budget plussed up because they currently are expecting only to be able to afford 15 tankers per year. I think the President could take some of the stimulus funds, which were ostensibly to be used for job creation, move that to the Air Force's budget so that we could, instead of having 15 per year, have 24 per year, which would allow each company to produce 12 tankers per year.

This would create an immediate influx of new jobs not just in the tanker procurement, but also in the surrounding supplier industries and in the communities. This would be an economic engine in the various States that this production would take place. It would be good for the warfighter, good for our economy, good for American jobs. The President ought to do it.

Mr. President, it is about jobs. I urge you to focus on this issue.

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL PAY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Madam Speaker, every day this country is falling deeper in debt. Today we owe more than \$12.4 trillion, and by 2016 our debt could be as much as \$20 trillion. After more than a decade of mistakes and neglect by both parties, Washington can no longer afford to ignore this issue.

It is time for Congress to get serious about getting Federal spending under control. We should start with our own salaries. Today I am introducing the Taking Responsibility for Congressional Pay Act, which will cut pay for Members of the House and the Senate by 5 percent. This would be the first

salary reduction for Members since April 1, 1933, in the heart of the Great Depression.

Restoring fiscal discipline in Washington will require some difficult decisions, and every agency has to do their part. Congress needs to lead by example to get the job done by taking action, and not just by making speeches. With this change we are fighting to change the culture in Washington and beginning to make the tough choices it takes to cut waste and find savings. It will be an important step toward bringing back real fiscal responsibility.

We are facing historic challenges. It will take historic action to address them. I urge my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the problem and taking responsibility for fixing it.

EXPORTS PROMOTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, trade creates jobs. In my home State of Washington, one in three jobs is dependent on foreign trade. So as Congress continues to focus on ways to create jobs, we must help American businesses export their products and services.

This weekend I will travel to my own district to visit companies who have partnered with Federal programs to increase exports and create jobs. Western Chemical, for instance, a small business in Ferndale, is a leader in fish health products and biosecurity supplies. It recently received \$500,000 in financing from the Export-Import Bank. By utilizing the Ex-Im Bank, Western Chemical is able to maintain cash flow, export their products, and protect the jobs at their Ferndale location.

Exports drive Washington State's economy, accounting for over 30 percent of economic growth over the past

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H973

decade in our State, and contributing to almost half of the new jobs created over the past 30 years in our State. So the recent establishment of the National Export Initiative, setting a goal to double U.S. exports in the next 5 years, is a step in the right direction. By finally utilizing the resources from the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Trade Rep's office, the Department of Commerce, the Ex-Im Bank, and the Department of Energy, the administration has made it a priority to help farmers and small businesses increase their exports and create 2 million new jobs here at home.

Now, we in Congress must provide the resources to help them do just that. First, we should support the effort to hire trade experts to serve as advocates for U.S. companies and assist the more than 23,000 American companies who are trading to begin or grow their export sales in 2011.

However, we must not forget that the engine that drives our economy is small business, and that over the last two decades small- and medium-sized businesses have accounted for almost 65 percent of new jobs created here in the U.S. Last year I introduced legislation that directs the Department of Commerce to assist these SMEs in exporting their products, particularly to developing economies like China. From 2000 to 2007, Washington State exports to China grew by 406 percent. This created jobs in sectors like transportation equipment, crop production, and even processed foods. I know that the U.S. Trade Rep's office has launched an initiative specifically aimed at increasing exports by small- and medium-sized firms here in the U.S. I stand ready to help.

Lastly, our farmers will benefit as well. For every \$1 billion in ag exports, 9,000 jobs are created, and \$1.4 billion in economic activity is generated. Our farmers, our small business owners want to export their products and services. They want to create jobs here in the United States. I am urging my colleagues to help them do this by supporting the National Export Initiative, which will in turn create jobs and launch us on a path towards long-term economic growth.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MARKEY of Colorado) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Chaplain John Beaver, National Chaplain of the American Legion, Mo-

bile, Alabama, offered the following prayer:

Our Lord God, we give You our praise for being so faithful and trustworthy. We give You our gratitude for displaying to us Your awesome presence in a very powerful way. We ask for Your wisdom to be given to each congressman and congresswoman in their deliberations today. Give them a compassionate heart, humility and discernment, and may we sense a unity through Your unfailing love.

We pray for the men and women in our military. Shield them from all dangers and give them the assurance of Your guidance and strength so that they may safely return home to their loved ones. Give comfort to our wounded warriors in body, mind, and spirit. Comfort those who are now grieving the loss of their loved ones.

Bless all our veterans and military organizations who serve from their hearts. Strengthen us in heart, mind, and spirit as we serve You, our God, and our beloved Nation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the whole number of the House is 432.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, March 1, 2010 at 2:15 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a report to the Congress regarding the National Emergency with respect to Zimbabwe.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-96)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2010.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 2010.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 1, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, March 1, 2010 at 2:15 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a message to the Congress regarding a proposed Constitution for the United States Virgin Islands.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

CONSTITUTION FOR THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of Public Law 94-584 (the "Act"), I hereby transmit to the Congress a proposed constitution for the United States Virgin Islands (USVI). The constitution, drafted by the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands, was submitted to me on December 31, 2009, by Governor John P. deJongh, United States Virgin Islands. In submitting the proposed constitution, Governor deJongh expressed his concerns about several provisions of the proposed constitution, but he also expressed his hope that the people of the United States Virgin Islands continue to "move ahead towards [their] goal of increased local governmental autonomy."

The Act requires that I submit this proposed constitution to the Congress, along with my comments. The Congress then has 60 days to amend, modify, or approve the proposed constitution. If approved, or approved with modification, the constitution will be submitted for a referendum in the Virgin Islands for acceptance or rejection by the people.

In carrying out my responsibilities pursuant to the Act, I asked the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Department of the Interior, to provide its views of the proposed constitution. The Department of Justice concluded that several features of the proposed constitution warrant analysis and comment, including: (1) the absence of an express recognition of United States sovereignty and the supremacy of Federal law; (2) provisions for a special election on the USVI's territorial status; (3) provisions conferring legal advantages on certain groups defined by place and timing of birth, timing of residency, or ancestry; (4) residence requirements for certain offices; (5) provisions guaranteeing legislative representation of certain geographic areas; (6) provisions addressing territorial waters and marine resources; (7) imprecise language in certain provisions of the proposed constitution's bill of rights; (8) the possible need to repeal certain Federal laws if the proposed USVI constitution is adopted; and (9) the effect of congressional action or inaction on the proposed constitution.

To assist the Congress in its deliberations about this important matter, I attach the analysis of the Department

of Justice, with which the Department of the Interior concurs. I believe that the analysis provided by the Department of Justice warrants careful attention.

I commend the electorate of the Virgin Islands and its governmental representatives in their continuing commitment to increasing self-government and the rule of law.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 2010.

RECONCILIATION—DEMOCRATS CONSIDER MANEUVERS TO PASS GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, a government takeover of health care was rushed to happen last July, but during overflowing town hall meetings and then in Virginia, Massachusetts and New Jersey, the American people made it perfectly clear that a Big Government takeover of health care is not an option.

Almost a year later, this message unfortunately hasn't been received by the liberal majority. Instead of working across the aisle and reforming the bill to include less government and more commonsense bipartisan principles, liberal leaders are talking about bending the rules and rushing this by way of a process called reconciliation. This is a legislative maneuver that requires fewer votes than the regular process.

So the American people should listen this afternoon. The liberal majority knows the American people do not want this bill. They are left with a tricky maneuver that ignores what people have been fighting for and saying since last summer. I urge citizens to make their voices heard.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

My sympathy to the family and friends of Charles Hamel of Chapin, South Carolina, a dedicated patriot.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY SAM HOUSTON

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is Sam Houston's birthday. He was born in Virginia on March 2, 1793. He lived primarily in Tennessee, but he got to Texas as fast as he could.

Houston fought with Davy Crockett and Andrew Jackson during the Creek Indian wars of 1812. Later, he served as a Congressman and a Governor of Tennessee.

Sam spent time throughout his life living with the Cherokee Indians where the chief adopted him, naming him "the Raven." He finally pulled up stakes and took off for Texas to help the Texas cause for independence

against Mexico. In 1836, General Sam and the boys successfully led the Texi'ans at the Battle of San Jacinto against Mexico, and Texas became a free and independent nation.

Sam Houston was president of the Republic of Texas, and 9 years later, when Texas joined the Union, he became Governor and then a U.S. Senator. He is the only person in United States history to have served as a Governor and a Member of Congress from two States. The City of Houston and one of my grandsons, Barrett Houston, is named in his honor.

And that's just the way it is.

HAZARDS BILL REAUTHORIZATION

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3820, the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2009, which we will be taking up later today.

This legislation reauthorizes and amends the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act, ensuring agencies as diverse as FEMA, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the National Institute of Science and Technology have continuing appropriate authorizations to research the causes and forecasting of natural disasters, as well as ways to limit their negative impact.

The recent earthquakes in Haiti and Chile have certainly demonstrated the importance of developing improved methods of predicting and mitigating natural disasters. The contrast in outcomes between these two quakes has also demonstrated the clear benefit of preparedness and scientifically based building codes in containing casualties from a major disaster, if not the economic losses.

Nearly every part of the United States is susceptible to natural disasters in some form or another, and reauthorizing the programs in H.R. 3820 will ensure we remain at the forefront of this important research.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

NATURAL HAZARDS RISK REDUCTION ACT OF 2010

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3820) to reauthorize Federal natural hazards reduction programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States faces significant risks from many types of natural hazards, including earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, wildfires, and floods. Increasing numbers of Americans are living in areas prone to these hazards.

(2) Earthquakes occur without warning and can have devastating effects. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, two recent earthquakes, the Northridge Earthquake in 1994, and the Loma Prieta Earthquake in 1989, killed nearly 100 people, injured 12,757, and caused \$33 billion in damages. Nearly all States face some level of seismic risk. Twenty-six urban areas in 14 States have a significant seismic risk.

(3) Severe weather is the most costly natural hazard, measured on a per year basis. According to data from the National Weather Service over the last 10 years, tornadoes, thunderstorms, and hurricanes have caused an average of 226 fatalities and \$16 billion of property damage per year. The 2005 hurricane season was one of the most destructive in United States history, killing 1,836 people, and causing \$80 billion in damage.

(4) The United States Fire Administration reports that 38 percent of new home construction in 2002 was in areas adjacent to, or intermixed with, wildlands. Fires in the wildland-urban interface are costly. For example, the 2007 California Witch fire alone caused \$1.3 billion in insured property losses, according to the Insurance Services Office (ISO). In addition, Government Accountability Office reported in 2007 that the Federal spending for wildfire suppression between 2001 and 2005 was, on average, \$2.9 billion per year.

(5) Developing better knowledge about natural hazard phenomena and their effects is crucial to assessing the risks these hazards pose to communities. Instrumentation, monitoring, and data gathering to characterize earthquakes and wind events are important activities to increase this knowledge.

(6) Current building codes and standards can mitigate the damages caused by natural hazards. The Institute for Business and Home Safety estimated that the \$19 billion in damage caused by Hurricane Andrew in 1994 could have been reduced by half if such codes and standards were in effect. Research for the continuous improvement of building codes, standards, and design practices—and for developing methods to retrofit existing structures—is crucial to mitigating losses from natural hazards.

(7) Since its creation in 1977, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program (NEHRP) has supported research to develop seismic codes, standards, and building practices that have been widely adopted. The NEHRP Recommended Provisions for Seismic Regulations for New Buildings and Other Structures and the Guidance for Seismic Performance Assessment of Buildings are two examples.

(8) Research to understand the institutional, social, behavioral, and economic factors that influence how households, businesses, and communities perceive risk and prepare for natural hazards, and how well they recover after a disaster, can increase the implementation of risk mitigation measures.

(9) A major goal of the Federal natural hazards-related research and development effort should be to reduce the loss of life and damage to communities and infrastructure through increasing the adoption of hazard mitigation measures.

(10) Research, development, and technology transfer to secure infrastructure is vitally important. Infrastructure that supports electricity, transportation, drinking water, and other services is vital immediately after a disaster, and their quick return to function speeds the economic recovery of a disaster-impacted community.

TITLE I—EARTHQUAKES

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act of 2010”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Section 2 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701) is repealed.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

Section 4 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7703) is amended by striking paragraphs (8) and (9).

SEC. 104. NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM.

Section 5 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7704) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Program shall be designed to—

“(A) research and develop effective methods, tools, and technologies to reduce the risk posed by earthquakes to the built environment, especially to lessen the risk to existing structures and lifelines;

“(B) improve the understanding of earthquakes and their effects on households, businesses, communities, buildings, structures, and lifelines, through interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research that involves engineering, natural sciences, and social sciences; and

“(C) facilitate the adoption of earthquake risk reduction measures by households, businesses, communities, local, State, and Federal governments, national standards and model building code organizations, architects and engineers, building owners, and others with a role in planning for disasters and planning, constructing, retrofitting, and insuring buildings, structures, and lifelines through—

“(i) grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and technical assistance;

“(ii) development of standards, guidelines, voluntary consensus standards, and other design guidance for earthquake hazards risk reduction for buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(iii) outreach and information dissemination to communities on location-specific earthquake hazards and methods to reduce the risks from those hazards; and

“(iv) development and maintenance of a repository of information, including technical data, on seismic risk and hazards reduction.”; and

(B) by striking paragraphs (3) through (5);

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROGRAM AGENCIES.—

“(1) LEAD AGENCY.—The National Institute of Standards and Technology (in this section referred to as the ‘Institute’) shall be responsible for planning and coordinating the Program. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the Institute shall—

“(A) ensure that the Program includes the necessary components to promote the imple-

mentation of earthquake hazards risk reduction measures by households, businesses, communities, local, State, and Federal governments, national standards and model building code organizations, architects and engineers, building owners, and others with a role in preparing for disasters, or the planning, constructing, retrofitting, and insuring of buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(B) support the development of performance-based seismic engineering tools, and work with the appropriate groups to promote the commercial application of such tools, through earthquake-related building codes, standards, and construction practices;

“(C) ensure the use of social science research and findings in informing research and technology development priorities, communicating earthquake risks to the public, developing earthquake risk mitigation strategies, and preparing for earthquake disasters;

“(D) coordinate all Federal post-earthquake investigations; and

“(E) when warranted by research or investigative findings, issue recommendations for changes in model codes to the relevant code development organizations, and report back to Congress on whether such recommendations were adopted.

“(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—In addition to the lead agency responsibilities described under paragraph (1), the Institute shall be responsible for carrying out research and development to improve building codes and standards and practices for buildings, structures, and lifelines. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the Institute shall—

“(A) work, in conjunction with other appropriate Federal agencies, to support the development of improved seismic standards and model codes;

“(B) in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies, work closely with standards and model code development organizations, professional societies, and practicing engineers, architects, and others involved in the construction of buildings, structures, and lifelines, to promote better building practices, including by—

“(i) developing technical resources for practitioners on new knowledge and standards of practice; and

“(ii) developing methods and tools to facilitate the incorporation of earthquake engineering principles into design and construction practices;

“(C) develop tools, technologies, methods, and practitioner guidance to feasibly and cost-effectively retrofit existing buildings and structures to increase their earthquake resiliency; and

“(D) work closely with national standards organizations, and other interested parties, to develop seismic safety standards and practices for new and existing lifelines.

“(3) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this paragraph referred to as the ‘Agency’), consistent with the Agency’s all hazards approach, shall be responsible for facilitating the development and adoption of standards, model building codes, and better seismic building practices, developing tools to assess earthquake hazards, promoting the adoption of hazard mitigation measures, and carrying out a program of direct assistance to States and localities to mitigate earthquake risks to buildings, structures, lifelines, and communities.

“(B) DIRECTOR’S DUTIES.—The Director of the Agency shall—

“(i) work closely with other relevant Federal agencies, standards and model building code development organizations, architects,

engineers, and other professionals, to facilitate the development and adoption of standards, model codes, and design and construction practices to increase the earthquake resiliency of new and existing buildings, structures, and lifelines in the—

“(I) preparation, maintenance, and wide dissemination of design guidance, model building codes and standards, and practices to increase the earthquake resiliency of new and existing buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(II) development of performance-based design guidelines and methodologies supporting model codes for buildings, structures, and lifelines; and

“(III) development of methods and tools to facilitate the incorporation of earthquake engineering principles into design and construction practices;

“(ii) develop tools, technologies, and methods to assist local planners, and others, to model and predict the potential impact of earthquake damage in seismically hazardous areas; and

“(iii) support the implementation of a comprehensive earthquake education and public awareness program, including the development of materials and their wide dissemination to all appropriate audiences, and support public access to locality-specific information that may assist the public in preparing for, mitigating against, responding to, and recovering from earthquakes and related disasters.

“(C) STATE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—The Director of the Agency shall operate a program of grants and assistance to enable States to develop mitigation, preparedness, and response plans, compare inventories and conduct seismic safety inspections of critical structures and lifelines, update building and zoning codes and ordinances to enhance seismic safety, increase earthquake awareness and education, and encourage the development of multistate groups for such purposes. The Director shall operate such programs in coordination with the all hazards mitigation and preparedness programs authorized by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), in order to ensure that such programs are as consistent as possible. In order to qualify for assistance under this subparagraph, a State must—

“(i) demonstrate that the assistance will result in enhanced seismic safety in the State;

“(ii) provide 50 percent of the costs of the activities for which assistance is being given, except that the Director may lower or waive the cost-share requirement for these activities in exceptional cases of economic hardship; and

“(iii) meet such other requirements as the Director of the Agency shall prescribe.

“(D) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to diminish the role and responsibility of the Federal Emergency Management Agency with regard to all hazards preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation.

“(4) UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.—The United States Geological Survey (in this paragraph referred to as the ‘Survey’) shall conduct research and other activities necessary to characterize and identify earthquake hazards, assess earthquake risks, monitor seismic activity, and provide real-time earthquake information. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the Survey shall—

“(A) conduct a systematic assessment of the seismic risks in each region of the Nation prone to earthquakes, including, where appropriate, the establishment and operation of intensive monitoring projects on haz-

ardous faults, detailed seismic hazard and risk studies in urban and other developed areas where earthquake risk is determined to be significant, and engineering seismology studies;

“(B) work with officials of State and local governments to ensure that they are knowledgeable about the specific seismic risks in their areas;

“(C) develop standard procedures, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for issuing earthquake alerts, including aftershock advisories, and, to the extent possible, ensure that such alerts are compatible with the Integrated Public Alerts and Warning System program authorized by section 202 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5132);

“(D) issue when justified, and notify the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency of, an earthquake prediction or other earthquake advisory, which may be evaluated by the National Earthquake Prediction Evaluation Council;

“(E) operate, as integral parts of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System, a National Earthquake Information Center and a national seismic network, together providing timely and accurate information on earthquakes world-wide;

“(F) support the operation of regional seismic networks in areas of higher seismic risk;

“(G) develop and support seismic instrumentation of buildings and other structures to obtain data on their response to earthquakes for use in engineering studies and assessment of damage;

“(H) monitor and assess Earth surface deformation as it pertains to the evaluation of earthquake hazards and impacts;

“(I) work with other Program agencies to maintain awareness of, and where appropriate cooperate with, earthquake risk reduction efforts in other countries, to ensure that the Program benefits from relevant information and advances in those countries;

“(J) maintain suitable seismic hazard maps in support of building codes for structures and lifelines, including additional maps needed for performance-based design approaches, and, to the extent possible, ensure that such maps are developed consistent with the multihazard advisory maps authorized by section 203(k) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133(k));

“(K) conduct a competitive, peer-reviewed process which awards grants and cooperative agreements to complement and extend related internal Survey research and monitoring activities; and

“(L) operate, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation, a Global Seismographic Network for detection of earthquakes around the world and research into fundamental earth processes.

“(5) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—The National Science Foundation shall be responsible for funding basic research that furthers the understanding of earthquakes, earthquake engineering, and community preparation and response to earthquakes. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

“(A) support multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research that will improve the resiliency of communities to earthquakes, including—

“(i) research that improves the safety and performance of buildings, structures, and lifelines, including the use of the large-scale experimental and computational facilities of the George E. Brown, Jr. Network for Engineering Earthquake Simulation;

“(ii) research to support more effective earthquake mitigation and response measures, such as developing better knowledge of

the specific types of vulnerabilities faced by segments of the community vulnerable to earthquakes, addressing the barriers they face in adopting mitigation and preparation measures, and developing methods to better communicate the risks of earthquakes and to promote mitigation; and

“(iii) research on the response of communities, households, businesses, and emergency responders to earthquakes;

“(B) support research to understand earthquake processes, earthquake patterns, and earthquake frequencies;

“(C) encourage prompt dissemination of significant findings, sharing of data, samples, physical collections, and other supporting materials, and development of intellectual property so research results can be used by appropriate organizations to mitigate earthquake damage;

“(D) work with other Program agencies to maintain awareness of, and where appropriate cooperate with, earthquake risk reduction research efforts in other countries, to ensure that the Program benefits from relevant information and advances in those countries; and

“(E) include to the maximum extent practicable diverse institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Alaska Native-serving institutions, and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions.”; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1) by inserting “on Natural Hazards Risk Reduction established under section 301 of the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010” after “Interagency Coordinating Committee”.

SEC. 105. POST-EARTHQUAKE INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.

Section 11 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7705e) is amended by striking “There is established” and all that follows through “conduct of such earthquake investigations.” and inserting “The Program shall include a post-earthquake investigations program, the purpose of which is to investigate major earthquakes so as to learn lessons which can be applied to reduce the loss of lives and property in future earthquakes. The lead Program agency, in consultation with each Program agency, shall organize investigations to study the implications of the earthquakes in the areas of responsibility of each Program agency. The investigations shall begin as rapidly as possible and may be conducted by grantees and contractors. The Program agencies shall ensure that the results of the investigations are disseminated widely.”.

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 12 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

“(9) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out this Act—

“(A) \$10,238,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(B) \$10,545,000 for fiscal year 2011;

“(C) \$10,861,000 for fiscal year 2012;

“(D) \$11,187,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(E) \$11,523,000 for fiscal year 2014.”;

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following:

“(3) There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States Geological Survey for carrying out this Act—

“(A) \$90,000,000 for fiscal year 2010, of which \$36,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System;

“(B) \$92,100,000 for fiscal year 2011, of which \$37,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System;

“(C) \$94,263,000 for fiscal year 2012, of which \$38,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System;

“(D) \$96,491,000 for fiscal year 2013, of which \$39,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System; and

“(E) \$98,786,000 for fiscal year 2014, of which \$40,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System.”;

(3) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following:

“(3) There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this Act—

“(A) \$64,125,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(B) \$66,049,000 for fiscal year 2011;

“(C) \$68,030,000 for fiscal year 2012;

“(D) \$70,071,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(E) \$72,173,000 for fiscal year 2014.”; and

(4) by adding at the end of subsection (d) the following:

“(3) There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for carrying out this Act—

“(A) \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(B) \$7,700,000 for fiscal year 2011;

“(C) \$7,931,000 for fiscal year 2012;

“(D) \$8,169,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(E) \$8,414,000 for fiscal year 2014.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 14 of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7708) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—”;

and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

TITLE II—WIND

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2010”.

SEC. 202. PURPOSE.

Section 202 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15701) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 202. PURPOSE.

“It is the purpose of the Congress in this title to achieve a major measurable reduction in losses of life and property from windstorms through the establishment and maintenance of an effective Windstorm Impact Reduction Program. The objectives of such Program shall include—

“(1) the education of households, businesses, and communities about the risks posed by windstorms, and the identification of locations, structures, lifelines, and segments of the community which are especially vulnerable to windstorm damage and disruption, and the dissemination of information on methods to reduce those risks;

“(2) the development of technologically and economically feasible design and construction methods and procedures to make new and existing structures, in areas of windstorm risk, windstorm resilient, giving high priority to the development of such methods and procedures for lifelines, structures associated with a potential high loss of life, and structures that are especially needed in times of disasters, such as hospitals and public safety and shelter facilities;

“(3) the implementation, in areas of major windstorm risk, of instrumentation to record and gather data on windstorms and the characteristics of the wind during those events, and continued research to increase the understanding of windstorm phenomena;

“(4) the development, publication, and promotion, in conjunction with State and local officials and professional organizations, of model building codes and standards and other means to encourage consideration of information about windstorm risk in making

decisions about land use policy and construction activity; and

“(5) the facilitation of the adoption of windstorm risk mitigation measures in areas of windstorm risk by households, businesses, and communities through outreach, incentive programs, and other means.”.

SEC. 203. DEFINITIONS.

Section 203(1) of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15702(1)) is amended by striking “Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy” and inserting “Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology”.

SEC. 204. NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

Section 204 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15703) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 204. NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

“(b) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Program shall be designed to—

“(1) research and develop cost-effective, feasible methods, tools, and technologies to reduce the risks posed by windstorms to the built environment, especially to lessen the risk to existing structures and lifelines;

“(2) improve the understanding of windstorms and their impacts on households, businesses, communities, buildings, structures, and lifelines, through interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research that involves engineering, natural sciences, and social sciences; and

“(3) facilitate the adoption of windstorm risk reduction measures by households, businesses, communities, local, State and Federal governments, national standards and model building code organizations, architects and engineers, building owners, and others with a role in planning for disasters and planning, constructing, retrofitting, and insuring buildings, structures, and lifelines through—

“(A) grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and technical assistance;

“(B) development of hazard maps, standards, guidelines, voluntary consensus standards, and other design guidance for windstorm risk reduction for buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(C) outreach and information dissemination to communities on site specific windstorm hazards and ways to reduce the risks from those hazards; and

“(D) development and maintenance of a repository of information, including technical data, on windstorm hazards and risk reduction;

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROGRAM AGENCIES.—

“(1) LEAD AGENCY.—The National Institute of Standards and Technology (in this section referred to as the ‘Institute’) shall be responsible for planning and coordinating the Program. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the Institute shall—

“(A) ensure that the Program includes the necessary components to promote the implementation of windstorm risk reduction measures by households, businesses, communities, local, State, and Federal governments, national standards and model building code organizations, architects and engineers, building owners, and others with a role in planning and preparing for disasters, and planning constructing, and retrofitting, and insuring buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(B) support the development of performance-based engineering tools, and work with the appropriate groups to promote the commercial application of such tools, through

wind-related building codes, standards, and construction practices;

“(C) ensure the use of social science research and findings in informing the development of technology and research priorities, in communicating windstorm risks to the public, in developing windstorm risk mitigation strategies, and in preparing for windstorm disasters;

“(D) coordinate all Federal post-windstorm investigations; and

“(E) when warranted by research or investigative findings, issue recommendations for changes in model codes to the relevant code development organizations, and report back to Congress on whether such recommendations were adopted.

“(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—In addition to the lead agency responsibilities described under paragraph (1), the Institute shall be responsible for carrying out research and development to improve model codes, standards, design guidance and practices for the construction and retrofit of buildings, structures, and lifelines. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the Institute shall—

“(A) support the development of instrumentation, data processing, and archival capabilities, and standards for the instrumentation and its deployment, to measure wind, wind loading, and other properties of severe wind and structure response;

“(B) coordinate with other appropriate Federal agencies to make the data described in subparagraph (A) available to researchers, standards and code developers, and local planners;

“(C) support the development of tools and methods for the collection of data on the loss of and damage to structures, and data on surviving structures after severe windstorm events;

“(D) improve the knowledge of the impact of severe wind on buildings, structures, lifelines, and communities;

“(E) develop cost-effective windstorm impact reduction tools, methods, and technologies;

“(F) work, in conjunction with other appropriate Federal agencies, to support the development of wind standards and model codes; and

“(G) in conjunction with other appropriate Federal agencies, work closely with standards and model code development organizations, professional societies, and practicing engineers, architects, and others involved in the construction of buildings, structures, and lifelines, to promote better building practices, including by—

“(i) supporting the development of technical resources for practitioners to implement new knowledge; and

“(ii) supporting the development of methods and tools to incorporate wind engineering principles into design and construction practices.

“(3) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—The Federal Emergency Management Agency, consistent with the Agency’s all hazards approach, shall support the development of risk assessment tools and effective mitigation techniques, assist with windstorm-related data collection and analysis, and support outreach, information dissemination, and implementation of windstorm preparedness and mitigation measures by households, businesses, and communities, including by—

“(A) working to develop or improve risk-assessment tools, methods, and models;

“(B) work closely with other appropriate Federal agencies to develop and facilitate the adoption of windstorm impact reduction measures, including by—

“(i) developing cost-effective retrofit measures for existing buildings, structures,

and lifelines to improve windstorm performance;

“(ii) developing methods, tools, and technologies to improve the planning, design, and construction of new buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(iii) supporting the development of model wind codes and standards for buildings, structures, and lifelines; and

“(iv) developing technical resources for practitioners that reflect new knowledge and standards of practice; and

“(C) develop and disseminate guidelines for the construction of windstorm shelters.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to diminish the role and responsibility of the Federal Emergency Management Agency with regard to all hazards preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation.

“(4) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall support atmospheric sciences research and data collection to improve the understanding of the behavior of windstorms and their impact on buildings, structures, and lifelines, including by—

“(A) working with other appropriate Federal agencies to develop and deploy instrumentation to measure speed and other characteristics of wind, and to collect, analyze, and make available such data;

“(B) working with officials of State and local governments to ensure that they are knowledgeable about, and prepared for, the specific windstorm risks in their area;

“(C) supporting the development of suitable wind speed maps and other derivative products that support building codes and other hazard mitigation approaches for buildings, structures, and lifelines, and, to the extent possible, ensure that such maps and other derivative products are developed consistent with the multihazard advisory maps authorized by section 203(k) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133(k));

“(D) conducting a competitive, peer-reviewed process which awards grants and cooperative agreements to complement the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's wind-related and storm surge-related research and data collection activities;

“(E) working with other appropriate Federal agencies and State and local governments to develop or improve risk-assessment tools, methods, and models; and

“(F) working with other appropriate Federal agencies to develop storm surge models to better understand the interaction between windstorms and bodies of water.

“(5) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—The National Science Foundation shall be responsible for funding basic research that furthers the understanding of windstorms, wind engineering, and community preparation and response to windstorms. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

“(A) support multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research that will improve the resiliency of communities to windstorms, including—

“(i) research that improves the safety and performance of buildings, structures, and lifelines;

“(ii) research to support more effective windstorm mitigation and response measures, such as developing better knowledge of the specific types of vulnerabilities faced by segments of the community vulnerable to windstorms, addressing the barriers they face in adopting mitigation and preparation measures, and developing methods to better communicate the risks of windstorms and to promote mitigation; and

“(iii) research on the response of communities to windstorms, including on the effec-

tiveness of the emergency response, and the recovery process of communities, households, and businesses;

“(B) support research to understand windstorm processes, windstorm patterns, and windstorm frequencies;

“(C) encourage prompt dissemination of significant findings, sharing of data, samples, physical collections, and other supporting materials, and development of intellectual property so research results can be used by appropriate organizations to mitigate windstorm damage;

“(D) work with other Program agencies to maintain awareness of, and where appropriate cooperate with, windstorm risk reduction research efforts in other countries, to ensure that the Program benefits from relevant information and advances in those countries; and

“(E) include to the maximum extent practicable diverse institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Alaska Native-serving institutions, and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions.”

SEC. 205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15706) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(2) \$9,972,500 for fiscal year 2011;

“(3) \$10,271,600 for fiscal year 2012;

“(4) \$10,579,800 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(5) \$10,897,200 for fiscal year 2014.

“(b) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(2) \$9,972,500 for fiscal year 2011;

“(3) \$10,271,600 for fiscal year 2012;

“(4) \$10,579,800 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(5) \$10,897,200 for fiscal year 2014.

“(c) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(2) \$4,243,600 for fiscal year 2011;

“(3) \$4,370,900 for fiscal year 2012;

“(4) \$4,502,000 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(5) \$4,637,100 for fiscal year 2014.

“(d) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2010;

“(2) \$2,334,000 for fiscal year 2011;

“(3) \$2,404,000 for fiscal year 2012;

“(4) \$2,476,100 for fiscal year 2013; and

“(5) \$2,550,400 for fiscal year 2014.”

TITLE III—INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON NATURAL HAZARDS RISK REDUCTION

SEC. 301. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON NATURAL HAZARDS RISK REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Natural Hazards Risk Reduction, chaired by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(1) MEMBERSHIP.—In addition to the chair, the Committee shall be composed of—

(A) the directors of—

(i) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(ii) the United State Geological Survey;

(iii) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(iv) the National Science Foundation;

(v) the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and

(vi) the Office of Management and Budget; and

(B) the head of any other Federal agency the Committee considers appropriate.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall not meet less than 2 times a year at the call of the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

(3) GENERAL PURPOSE AND DUTIES.—The Committee shall oversee the planning and coordination of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and shall make proposals for planning and coordination of any other Federal research for natural hazard mitigation that the Committee considers appropriate.

(4) STRATEGIC PLANS.—The Committee shall develop and submit to Congress, not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) a Strategic Plan for the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program that includes—

(i) prioritized goals for such Program that will mitigate against the loss of life and property from future earthquakes;

(ii) short-term, mid-term, and long-term research objectives to achieve those goals;

(iii) a description of the role of each Program agency in achieving the prioritized goals;

(iv) the methods by which progress towards the goals will be assessed;

(v) an explanation of how the Program will foster the transfer of research results onto outcomes, such as improved building codes;

(vi) a description of the role of social science in informing the development of the prioritized goals and research objectives; and

(vii) a description of how the George E. Brown, Jr. Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation and the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System will be used in achieving the prioritized goals and research objectives; and

(B) a Strategic Plan for the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program that includes—

(i) prioritized goals for such Program that will mitigate against the loss of life and property from future windstorms;

(ii) short-term, mid-term, and long-term research objectives to achieve those goals;

(iii) a description of the role of each Program agency in achieving the prioritized goals;

(iv) the methods by which progress towards the goals will be assessed;

(v) an explanation of how the Program will foster the transfer of research results onto outcomes, such as improved building codes; and

(vi) a description of the role of social science in informing the development of the prioritized goals and research objectives.

(5) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and at least once every two years thereafter, the Committee shall submit to the Congress—

(A) a report on the progress of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program that includes—

(i) a description of the activities funded for the previous two years of the Program, a description of how these activities align with the prioritized goals and research objectives established in the Strategic Plan, and the budgets, per agency, for these activities;

(ii) the outcomes achieved by the Program for each of the goals identified in the Strategic Plan;

(iii) a description of any recommendations made to change existing building codes that were the result of Program activities; and

(iv) a description of the extent to which the Program has incorporated recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction; and

(B) a report on the progress of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program that includes—

(i) a description of the activities funded for the previous two years of the Program, a description of how these activities align with the prioritized goals and research objectives established in the Strategic Plan, and the budgets, per agency, for these activities;

(ii) the outcomes achieved by the Program for each of the goals identified in the Strategic Plan;

(iii) a description of any recommendations made to change existing building codes that were the result of Program activities; and

(iv) a description of the extent to which the Program has incorporated recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction.

(6) **COORDINATED BUDGET.**—The Committee shall develop a coordinated budget for the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program and a coordinated budget for the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program. These budgets shall be submitted to the Congress at the time of the President's budget submission for each fiscal year.

(b) **ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON NATURAL HAZARDS REDUCTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish an Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction, an Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction, and other such advisory committees as the Director considers necessary to advise the Institute on research, development, and technology transfer activities to mitigate the impact of natural disasters.

(2) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION.**—The Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction shall be composed of at least 11 members, none of whom may be employees of the Federal Government, including representatives of research and academic institutions, industry standards development organizations, emergency management agencies, State and local government, and business communities who are qualified to provide advice on earthquake hazards reduction and represent all related scientific, architectural, and engineering disciplines. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be considered by Federal agencies in implementing the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

(3) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.**—The Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction shall be composed of at least 7 members, none of whom may be employees of the Federal Government, including representatives of research and academic institutions, industry standards development organizations, emergency management agencies, State and local government, and business communities who are qualified to provide advice on windstorm impact reduction and represent all related scientific, architectural, and engineering disciplines. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be considered by Federal agencies in implementing the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

(4) **ASSESSMENTS.**—The Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction and the Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction shall offer assessments on—

(A) trends and developments in the natural, social, and engineering sciences and

practices of earthquake hazards or windstorm impact mitigation;

(B) the priorities of the Programs' Strategic Plans;

(C) the coordination of the Programs; and

(D) and any revisions to the Programs which may be necessary.

(5) **REPORTS.**—At least every two years, the Advisory Committees shall report to the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology on the assessments carried out under paragraph (4) and their recommendations for ways to improve the Programs. In developing recommendations for the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, the Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction shall consider the recommendations of the United States Geological Survey Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee.

(c) **COORDINATION OF FEDERAL DISASTER RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Subcommittee on Disaster Reduction of the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources of the National Science and Technology Council shall submit a report to the Congress identifying—

(1) current Federal research, development, and technology transfer activities that address hazard mitigation for natural disasters, including earthquakes, hurricanes, tornados, wildfires, floods, and the current budgets for these activities;

(2) areas of research that are common to two or more of the hazards identified in paragraph (1); and

(3) opportunities to create synergies between the research activities for the hazards identified in paragraph (1).

TITLE IV—NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION SAFETY TEAM ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 401. NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION SAFETY TEAM ACT AMENDMENTS.

The National Construction Safety Team Act (15 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a)—

(A) by striking “a building or buildings” and inserting “a building, buildings, or infrastructure”; and

(B) by striking “To the maximum extent practicable, the Director shall establish and deploy a Team within 48 hours after such an event.” and inserting “The Director shall make a decision whether to deploy a Team within 72 hours after such an event.”;

(2) in section 2(b)(1), by striking “buildings” and inserting “buildings or infrastructure”;

(3) in section 2(b)(2)(A), by striking “building” and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(4) in section 2(b)(2)(D), by striking “buildings” and inserting “buildings or infrastructure”;

(5) in section 2(c)(1), by striking “the United States Fire Administration and”;

(6) in section 2(c)(1)(G), by striking “building” and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(7) in section 2(c)(1)(J)—

(A) by striking “building” and inserting “building or infrastructure”; and

(B) by inserting “and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004” after “Act of 1977”;

(8) in section 4(a), by striking “investigating a building” and inserting “investigating building and infrastructure”;

(9) in section 4(a)(1)—

(A) by striking “a building” and inserting “a building or infrastructure”; and

(B) by striking “building” both of the other places it appears and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(10) in section 4(a)(3), by striking “building” both places it appears and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(11) in section 4(b), by striking “building” both places it appears and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(12) in section 4(c)(1) and (2), by striking “building” both places it appears and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(13) by amending section 4(d)(1) to read as follows:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, a Team investigation shall have priority over any other investigation which is related to the purpose and duties set forth in section 2(b) and undertaken by any other Federal agency.”;

(14) in section 4(d)(3) and (4), by striking “building” both places it appears and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(15) in section 4, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTIGATIONS.**—With respect to an investigation relating to an infrastructure failure, a Federal agency with primary jurisdiction over the failed infrastructure which is conducting an investigation and asserts priority over the Team investigation shall have such priority. Such priority shall not otherwise affect the authority of the Team to continue its investigation under this Act.”;

(16) in section 7(a), by striking “on request and at reasonable cost”;

(17) in section 7(c), by striking “building” and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(18) in section 8(1) and (4), by striking “building” both places it appears and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(19) in section 9, by striking “the United States Fire Administration and”;

(20) in section 9(2)(C), by striking “building” and inserting “building or infrastructure”;

(21) in section 10(3), by striking “building” and inserting “building and infrastructure”;

(22) in section 11(a), by striking “the United States Fire Administration and”; and

TITLE V—FIRE RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 501. FIRE RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 16(a)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278f(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by inserting “fires at the wildland-urban interface,” after “but not limited to,”; and

(2) in subparagraph (E), by inserting “fires at the wildland-urban interface,” after “types of fires, including”.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3820, the bill under consideration.

□ 1415

Mr. WU. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3820, the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010. This bipartisan bill addresses a crucial need—securing our communities against earthquakes, hurricanes, tornados, and other natural phenomena.

As we saw last month in Haiti and just this past weekend in Chile, earthquakes can strike without warning, can cause massive damage and many, many casualties. Mitigation efforts, like advanced building codes, are crucial to preventing loss and injury. Preparation saves lives. The Chilean experience demonstrates the importance of preparation, of building codes, and of education.

H.R. 3820 reauthorizes two very important natural hazard mitigation programs—the Natural Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

Since Congress created the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, or NEHRP, in 1977, it has been used to study earthquake phenomena, to identify seismic hazards, and to develop building codes and practices to withstand earthquakes. This reauthorization will allow the U.S. Geological Survey, FEMA, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to continue their efforts to develop and to promote earthquake mitigation measures.

Created in 2004, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, or NWIRP, is also a critical tool in countering the destructive forces of hurricanes, tornadoes, and other severe windstorms. Destructive windstorms are not limited to Florida, to the Gulf Coast, or to Tornado Alley in our Midwest. Two years ago, in my Pacific Northwest, we experienced 150-mile-per-hour winds, a storm which killed 18 people and which caused nearly \$200 million in damage. Just last week, gusts of up to 90 miles per hour were reported in the Northeast, knocking out power for more than 87,000 New Yorkers and others in Pennsylvania through the Mid-Atlantic. The purpose of NWIRP is to study wind hazards and to develop building codes and practices to prevent damage.

The adoption of mitigation measures is the crucial last step in preventing losses from natural disasters. H.R. 3820 includes provisions to develop ways to cost effectively retrofit existing structures and to secure lifelines as well as provisions for research to identify the best methods to encourage homeowners, businesses, and communities to plan for natural disasters and to adopt mitigation and education measures.

H.R. 3820 also brings greater coordination to Federal natural hazards R&D efforts. It directs the relevant agencies to develop a multihazards research agenda and to identify where common research approaches are appropriate across different types of hazards. This will enable a research agenda where the lessons learned in one disaster will be applied to help prevent damage in another and, therefore, save lives. It will use scarce taxpayer dollars more effectively and more efficiently.

I would like to thank the ranking member of the Technology and Innova-

tion Subcommittee, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, for his hard work and support in helping us bring this bill to the floor.

I would also like to recognize my friend and colleague, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, who is here on the floor with us today.

I would similarly like to thank the chairman of the full Science and Technology Committee, Mr. BART GORDON of Tennessee, and the ranking member, Mr. HALL of Texas, the unforgettable Mr. HALL.

H.R. 3820 is supported by the American Society of Civil Engineers. I urge my colleagues to vote for its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3820, the National Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010.

Whether they come in the form of hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, tsunamis, or other phenomena, natural hazards are infrequent and inevitable, and as illustrated by recent events in Haiti and in Chile, can be devastating to life and property.

The infrequency of such events is, of course, no excuse for complacency in taking steps to address them. The programs authorized in this legislation are the Federal Government's primary means of advancing science and technology to mitigate the risks of natural hazards. This legislation authorizes two programs—the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, or NEHRP, and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, NWIRP.

NEHRP was established in 1977 in response to growing concerns about the threat of damaging earthquakes. It is an agency effort consisting of four participating agencies: firstly, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, supporting problem-focused earthquake engineering research and development programs aimed at improving building design codes and construction standards; secondly, the National Science Foundation, NSF, supporting basic research in geoscience, engineering, economic, and social aspects of earthquakes; thirdly, the U.S. Geological Survey, USGS, conducting basic and applied Earth science and seismology research; fourthly, FEMA, which supports mitigation, response, education, outreach, and implementation of research results.

Similarly, the Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, created in 2004 and modeled after NEHRP, consists of four agencies—NIST, NSF and FEMA, as well as NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, which funds research in the atmospheric sciences—to better understand, predict, and respond to hurricanes, tornadoes, and other windstorms.

The goals and activities of these two programs are clear. From engineering research to improve the structural resiliency of buildings, to the development of model building codes and

standards, to recovery and response operations, the opportunities for leveraging earthquake mitigation and windstorm mitigation activities are numerous and substantial. Accordingly, the primary objective of this legislation is to establish an overarching coordination structure to improve communication, to exploit potential synergies, and to ensure that new knowledge developed from both programs can be translated into practice and, eventually, into decreased vulnerabilities.

Much progress has been made with the overall authorization levels in this bill, which have been reduced from prior authorization levels. In particular, at three of the four NEHRP agencies, authorized levels have been reduced to more realistic levels that still achieve its goals—a responsible approach given our ominous overall fiscal situation. At the fourth NEHRP agency, USGS, the authorization level has been modestly increased. This reflects a position by the lead authors of the bill that earthquake research should be a priority at USGS.

These two programs, if directed to the right priorities and implemented as a true, coordinated interagency effort, can become more effective and can be leveraged many times over.

I appreciate the hard work from my fellow members of the committee and staff to balance the need for minimizing the risk of these natural disasters with the fiscal reality of large deficits and debt.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Research and Science Education Subcommittee of the Science Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I have a background as an engineer. I actually have a master's degree in systems engineering. I understand the need for understanding how systems work and for understanding what can be done in preparation so that, in the case of Mr. WU's bill, we can do the best that we can to mitigate, to avoid the problems, and to deal with what happens in the aftermath of earthquakes and windstorms.

I thank Mr. WU for this bill, and I thank Chairman GORDON also for moving this bill forward and for bringing it to the House floor. I thank the Republicans for their work, and I thank Mr. BROUN here today.

I think this is something that we often forget about until after a disaster strikes. With the earthquake in Chile, we've heard so much talk about the planning beforehand, about the requirements that buildings have to be designed in a certain way to withstand earthquakes, and about the lives that were saved. Probably tens of thousands of lives were saved from this. This was all through a type of planning that can come through this bill.

I think it is also important—and I see this so often, not just in the NSF, NIST, USGS, or NOAA. We see all these silos—all these departments, agencies—which are doing separate work, and they don't oftentimes enough coordinate the work that they are doing. So I think this bill does a very good job of making sure that we have the coordination when it comes to planning for earthquakes and for looking into what we can do about that for windstorms.

So I thank Mr. WU for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hard work that my good friend from Oregon (Mr. WU) and my friend from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) have put into this bill. Certainly, as a fiscal conservative, I am concerned about how the agencies within the Federal Government coordinate their activities and coordinate their communications. I congratulate Mr. WU on trying to bring overarching communications between these four governmental agencies.

Just today on Fox and Friends news, they had a seismologist who was predicting just in the very near future a major earthquake which would affect Mr. WU's home State of Oregon, the State of Washington, as well as the State of California. We've seen a tremendous number of earthquakes recently, and, I think, having the Federal Government agencies coordinate their efforts to try to find some way to communicate between those is absolutely a much needed process. I congratulate Mr. WU on his efforts to do that.

So, having said all of that, Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, but I do just want to congratulate Mr. WU again on his hard work on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WU. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his very kind remarks.

Madam Speaker, we do not and we actually should not agree all the time, because these are sincere differences which, I think, we reflect in our personal values and in the values of our constituents; but the legislation that we are dealing with today demonstrates this Congress' working at its best on those issues where we should be coming together, and we do.

I want to thank the gentleman. I want to thank Mr. SMITH and Mr. HALL on the minority side.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WU. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I agree wholeheartedly.

I wish we could get together on health reform and could get together and do something that's right for the American people. I wish we could get together on an economic stimulus package. Folks on our side would very much like to do so. It is unfortunate that we have such a philosophical divide on many issues.

Mr. WU, I have enjoyed working with you on the Science and Technology Committee. I love your State. I did my internship in Portland, Oregon, and I know that's where you live, in that area. I wish we could get together on many issues. I congratulate you on your leadership and for bringing together a bipartisan bill so that people do get together at least on this issue.

I commit to you, as well as to my Democratic colleagues, to work to try to find some commonsense solutions, market-based solutions, to health reform and to getting our economy back on course and other things. I hope that we can work together on these.

□ 1430

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. Sometimes the largest things start in small ways, and the longest journey starts with a small step, and perhaps we are taking that step today, Mr. BROUN.

Storms teach us all sorts of things, and personal effort and caring matter a lot. The snowstorms that paralyzed this city a couple of weeks ago in some respects are a metaphor for what has been going on with the political and policy mechanisms that also occupy this city.

I believe that in my home State, within a few hours of the storm being over, we would be out there starting to clean up, and we would be doing a reasonable job fairly soon. What happened here was paralysis for days at a time, schools closing for the rest of the week, and people complaining about the city not cleaning the streets.

But what I noticed was that in my neighborhood, folks did shovel their sidewalks, and it makes a big difference. Just take care of your own sidewalk, and maybe help your neighbor, if your neighbor is old or just not able to do these things for him or herself. In the second storm, I actually offered to pay my son a little bit of money to shovel the whole block. Shoveling the block was the second most important thing to do. I think the most important thing to do was to teach him civic virtue and what serving the broader good is all about.

This bill does serve the broader national good. The example of Chile demonstrates the importance of preparation. It demonstrates the importance of American technology, because the Chileans borrowed their designs from the United States. It also helps us understand where we need to get better, because their highways had a lot of collapses, just as our highways during the quake in Los Angeles unfortunately collapsed, and perhaps we can improve our designs for that.

Education is also a very, very important component of earthquake safety. In my State, it is estimated that we could have a 9.5 Richter scale quake, just like the world's largest quake ever recorded. That one was down in Peru and Chile, and it was 9.5 on the Richter scale. The scientists tell us that is

what can happen in the Pacific Northwest, and it actually has happened in the past.

Since the last ice age, these quakes have occurred every 200 to 1,000 years, and the average period was 300 years. We didn't know that this was going to go on. When I moved to Oregon, we didn't know anything about problems like this. But this is the problem of science.

Through research on tree roots which were buried in mud and research on Japanese records, we found out that the last such earthquake occurred in January of 1701, 309 years ago. So if the average period is 300 years, we are in that zone, and we ought to be prepared.

Education is key. Preparation is key. And it is not just the buildings, it is not just design, but it is also about educating people about what to do before the quake, what to do during the quake, what to do after the quake, and how do you prepare for a tsunami, how do you get out of the way.

It takes courage, and it takes overcoming fear, and there are different kinds of courage, and there are different kinds of fear. I know that some folks are concerned about what happens when we move to an all-hazards approach to these natural phenomena, and I can tell you that this Congress, this committee, Mr. BROUN and I, will stand united in providing the resources so that we can appropriately reduce risk across different phenomena, whether the risk is created by wind, by water, by earthquake, or by tsunami. That is the obligation of leadership, and we will provide the leadership to do that, because at the end of the day, the earthquakes, the wind and other hazards, they know no bounds, they know no geographic bounds, and they know no bounds with respect to age or income or any other hazard.

Madam Speaker, I ask all Members to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3820, the "Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010". This bill reauthorizes natural hazard risk reduction programs, in particular the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program.

Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and I have been strong advocates for the reduction of the risks our Nation faces from natural hazards. I commend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON), Chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), for bringing this bill before the House today and for the cooperative spirit in which they have worked with our committee on this legislation.

The "Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010", and the programs it authorizes, will assist communities and citizens across the country in reducing their risk from several natural hazards, that, unfortunately, occur all too often in our Nation. Specifically, this legislation addresses the risks from three hazards: earthquakes, windstorms, and fires.

We have all recently seen the destruction that earthquakes can cause. On January 12,

2010, a catastrophic earthquake measuring 7.0 on the Richter scale struck the island nation of Haiti. This earthquake was the largest earthquake to hit Haiti in over 200 years. An estimated 230,000 people lost their lives in this disaster, which affected over three million people.

I have a deep, personal connection to the people of Haiti: before I went to work for people of Minnesota, I lived in Haiti for almost 3 years. Since that time, I have followed events in that nation and have maintained many good friendships with Haitian citizens. In fact, I was in Haiti shortly before the earthquake hit, in October 2009. When I accompanied Speaker PELOSI on a bipartisan, bicameral trip to Haiti last month, I was struck by visions of places I saw just three months prior that were unrecognizable as they lie in complete and utter ruin. These haunting images clearly demonstrate the power of an earthquake, and the importance of ensuring we do everything we can to protect our citizens from such devastation.

This past weekend, another devastating earthquake struck Chile. This earthquake is believed to be hundreds of times more powerful than the earthquake that struck Haiti, yet early reports seem to indicate that the loss of life and destruction—while no less tragic—was less severe than in Haiti. There are likely a number of reasons for the reduced damage, including where the earthquake struck. However, it must also be recognized that Chile is a nation that is at great risk of seismic activity and has taken significant steps to reduce the risk that earthquakes pose to that nation and its citizens.

H.R. 3820 also addresses risks due to windstorms and wildfires. In my district in Minnesota, we have been unfortunate to bear witness to the devastating effects of both of these hazards, and how they can be related. On July 4, 1999, a straight line windstorm, also known as a derecho, struck the Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness Area and downed millions of trees. Not only did this devastate the wilderness area and its surroundings, it also created a huge fire hazard from the fallen timber.

The citizens of Minnesota made every effort to reduce the risk of the fire. Residents in the affected areas utilized Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, mitigation funds to install outdoor sprinkler systems to protect against wildfire. Unfortunately, although not unpredictably, in 2007, the Ham Lake Fire struck the area. The structures that had installed and maintained sprinkler systems were protected from the fire. This is another good example of how important it is to reduce the risk of natural hazards.

H.R. 3820 contains several amendments at the request of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that will help ensure the earthquake, windstorm, and wildfire risk reduction programs authorized in this bill are consistent with FEMA's all-hazards approach. While the Federal Government currently administers risk reduction programs for earthquakes, floods, and windstorms as free-standing programs, it is important that such programs do not operate completely independently or in a "stove piped" manner. In the past, I have strongly opposed efforts by the Department of Homeland Security to channel Federal resources and focus away from all-hazards preparedness and response programs

into terrorism programs, because this approach would segment by particular risk.

Specifically, H.R. 3820, as amended, will require that the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program and the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program to be operated in coordination with the all-hazards mitigation and preparedness programs administered by FEMA and authorized by the Stafford Act. In this manner, States, communities, and citizens can utilize these programs in a coordinated manner. FEMA is already taking steps to coordinate among the agency's mitigation programs, by making the administrative requirements of its all-hazards and flood programs as consistent as possible. We anticipate FEMA will apply this sound approach to the programs authorized under this bill as well.

In addition, this legislation calls for the mapping of windstorm and earthquake risks. H.R. 3820, as amended, will require that, to the extent possible, these maps be developed consistent with the multi-hazard advisory maps authorized by the Stafford Act. It is not efficient or effective for communities to use separate maps identifying risk from each particular natural hazard the community may face. As hazard maps are now digitized, data for each type of risk can be easily superimposed on the same map, which will allow communities to use one common map in planning and identifying risks.

Finally, H.R. 3820 contains amendments to the National Construction Safety Teams Act and expands authority of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to deploy teams to investigate infrastructure failure. NIST's current authority is limited to building collapse investigations. I am pleased that this bill, as amended, clarifies that the authority to deploy teams for infrastructure failure is limited to NIST's existing authority and expertise to investigate the structural causes of collapse, as well as building codes, and does not give NIST authority beyond that arena, such as a related transportation accident and incident investigation if there is also an infrastructure failure component. The amendment also ensures that if another Federal agency with jurisdiction over the infrastructure investigates the failure, such agency investigation will have priority over the NIST investigation. I look forward to continued work with the Committee on Science and Technology on this provision as we move ahead with this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3820, the "Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2010."

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3820, the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2009. As a representative of a state that faces perhaps more natural hazard risk than any other—including not just from earthquakes, but also wildfires, windstorms, landslides, and tsunamis—I cannot overstate the importance of the programs authorized in this legislation, which are essential for protecting the lives and property of tens of millions of Californians.

Two tragedies over the past two months have shown us the dramatic difference that comes from being properly prepared for a natural disaster. The magnitude 7.0 earthquake in Haiti on January 12th struck a country that was woefully unprepared for such an event. Unreinforced buildings collapsed like houses of cards, and an almost unfathomable 200,000 people were killed. This past Sunday, a far-

stronger magnitude 8.8 earthquake hit Chile, and while this tragedy claimed the lives of over 700, the death toll was much lower than Haiti's because people were protected by buildings constructed to withstand that sort of shaking.

The United States has not suffered these sorts of staggering casualties from a seismic event in over a hundred years, in large part due to the work of the U.S. Geological Survey's Earthquake Hazard Program. We cannot predict when the next major earthquake will strike the United States. But we know where it is most likely. And we have been able to enact building codes in those areas to protect people in their homes and offices. We have conducted preparedness drills so people know what to do when the Big One hits. We have been able to engineer pipelines, power lines, and roads to survive a major quake, so we can rebuild and recover as quickly as possible. The U.S. Geological Survey has helped make this all possible.

This legislation reauthorizes the National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program, of which the U.S. Geological Survey's Earthquake Hazard Program is a part. When this legislation was first reported out of the Science and Technology Committee, I was concerned about the cut in authorization levels to the U.S. Geological Survey, which I believed reflected the wrong message about the importance of this critical program. I am pleased to say that after a hearing in my subcommittee on January 20th, my good friends BART GORDON, Chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, and DAVID WU, chief sponsor of this legislation, worked with me to increase the authorization levels and put the Earthquake Hazard Program on the path for continued growth. I would also like to thank the ranking member of my subcommittee, DOUG LAMBORN of Colorado, for working with me in this endeavor, as well as all the scientists and engineers who wrote to me expressing their support for this program.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, but more importantly, I urge us all to help the people of Haiti and Chile in any way we can as they attempt to clean up and rebuild. The hopes and prayers of everyone in this Chamber are with them.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman DAVID WU, Subcommittee Ranking Member ADRIAN SMITH, and Ranking Member RALPH HALL for their hard work on this very important legislation that will do so much to help protect our communities from natural disasters. I also want to recognize the work of the Natural Resources Committee as well as the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in arriving at the text we are considering today. Both Chairman RAHALL and Chairman OBERSTAR have been enormously helpful in getting this bill to the floor today. In addition, I want to recognize JIM COSTA, who chairs the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources at the Natural Resources Committee, and who has been a leader in working to protect our communities from earthquakes. At this time I would like to insert an exchange of letters between Chairman RAHALL and myself into the RECORD, and once again thank both Chairmen for their support.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, February 24, 2010.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to work with you on H.R. 3820, the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2009, which was referred to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration that you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, and knowing of your interest in expediting this legislation, I am willing to waive further consideration of H.R. 3820 by the Committee on Natural Resources at this time. Of course, this waiver is not intended to prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over the provisions of this legislation or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Natural Resources on these provisions, and request your support if such a request is made.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 3820 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE
AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, February 24, 2010.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL II
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 3820, the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2009. Your support for this legislation and your assistance in ensuring its timely consideration are greatly appreciated.

I agree that provisions in the bill are of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Natural Resources. I acknowledge that by discharging the Committee on Natural Resources from further consideration of H.R. 3820, your Committee is not relinquishing its jurisdiction and I will fully support your request to be represented in a House-Senate conference on those provisions over which the Committee on Natural Resources has jurisdiction. A copy of our letters will be placed in the Committee Report on H.R. 3820 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

I value your cooperation and look forward to working with you as we move ahead with this important legislation.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3820, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further

proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1097), supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1097

Whereas engineers use their professional, scientific, and technical knowledge and skills in creative and innovative ways to fulfill the needs of society;

Whereas engineers have helped to address the major technological and infrastructural challenges of our time, including providing water, defending the Nation, and developing clean energy technologies that are needed to power the American people into the future;

Whereas engineers are a crucial link in research, development, and the transformation of scientific discoveries into useful products and jobs, as the people of the United States look more than ever to engineers and their imagination, knowledge, and analytical skills to meet the challenges of the future;

Whereas engineers play a crucial role in developing the consensus engineering standards that promote global collaboration and support reliable infrastructures;

Whereas the sponsors of National Engineers Week are working together to transform the engineering workforce through greater inclusion of women and underrepresented minorities;

Whereas the 2009 National Academy of Engineering and National Research Council report entitled "Engineering in K-12 Education" highlighted the potential role for engineering in primary and secondary education as a method to improve learning and achievement in science and mathematics, increase awareness of engineering and the work of engineers, help students understand and engage in engineering design, build interest in pursuing engineering as a career, and increase technological literacy;

Whereas an increasing number of the approximately 2,000,000 engineers in the United States are nearing retirement;

Whereas National Engineers Week has developed into a formal coalition of more than 100 professional societies, major corporations, and Government agencies that are dedicated to ensuring a diverse and well-educated engineering workforce, promoting literacy in science, technology, engineering, and math, and raising public awareness and appreciation of the contributions of engineers to society;

Whereas National Engineers Week is celebrated during the week of George Washington's birthday to honor the contributions that the first President, who was both a military engineer and a land surveyor, made to engineering; and

Whereas February 14, 2010, to February 20, 2010, has been designated as National Engineers Week by the National Engineers Week Foundation and its coalition members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week to increase understanding of and interest in engineering careers and to promote technological literacy and engineering education; and

(2) continues to work with the engineering community to ensure that the creativity and

contributions made by engineers can be expressed through research, development, standardization, and innovation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 1097, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1097, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week.

I would first like to thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Science Education, Mr. LIPINSKI, for introducing this resolution. As one of only a handful of engineers in Congress, Mr. LIPINSKI has and will continue to be a strong advocate for engineers and engineering on the Science and Technology Committee and in Congress.

National Engineers Week, which was held from February 14 to February 20, has grown into a formal coalition of more than 100 engineering, education, and cultural societies, major corporations, and government agencies. Its goal is to raise public awareness of the significant positive contributions to society by engineers and encourage students to become engineers.

This resolution supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. It also pledges that the House of Representatives will work with the engineering community to make sure that the creativity and contribution of the engineering community can be expressed through research, development, standardization, education, and innovation.

This is a vitally important cause for our country's future well-being. As China and India graduate record numbers of engineers, the number of engineering graduates in the United States is stagnant. This is a troubling sign for our ability to maintain our edge as the world's technologic leader.

I might add that numbers alone do not tell the story. Quality, as well as quantity, counts, and traditionally we in this country have focused on quality and maintaining the best education system and the best professional and technical communities that we can, and we intend to maintain that lead in quality also.

We also need to continue to highlight the importance engineers play in our

society and encourage our young people to enter into these careers. Engineering is a challenging field, but one that can be truly rewarding for both the engineer and our society.

I ask you to join me in supporting this effort, and urge passage of House Resolution 1097.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 1097 supports the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, which was celebrated this year February 14th through the 20th. The National Society of Professional Engineers established one of America's oldest professional outreach efforts, National Engineers Week, in 1951, to coincide with President George Washington's birthday. President Washington is considered our Nation's first engineer, notably for his survey work.

National Engineers Week is observed by more than 70 engineering, education, and cultural societies, and more than 50 corporations and governing agencies. The purpose of National Engineers Week is to call attention to the contributions to society that engineers make. It is also a time for engineers to emphasize the importance of learning math, science, and technical skills.

During this week, a wide range of activities are planned in order to promote interest in engineering and technology fields in the K-12 levels. Some of the events this year included Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, which was held on February 18th. Schools and businesses around the country used this to spark interest and enthusiasm for science and engineering among young women.

Also Discover Engineering Family Day in Washington, D.C., occurred on February 20, 2010, at the National Building Museum. After a full day of hands-on activities and amazing demonstrations, kids and their parents went home with a new appreciation for the wonders of engineering.

Engineers are a vital part of the American economy. Everywhere you turn, there is evidence of the hard work of an engineer. From designing and constructing cardiac pacemakers to the very form of transportation we use to move us from one place to another, engineering is all around us.

I applaud our American engineers and their ingenuity and am pleased to see opportunities such as National Engineers Week that raise awareness and give credit to all of the engineers and their valuable work and contributions to society. I hope that the awareness spreads interest in this rewarding profession to all young people of this Nation.

I support the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the Chair of the Research Subcommittee of the Science and Technology Committee.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1097, supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. As one of only a handful of engineers in Congress, as Chairman WU mentioned, I am proud to again sponsor this resolution honoring National Engineers Week.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. EHLERS, for working with me on this resolution and on many other issues. Unfortunately for this institution and for America's science and technology policy, Dr. EHLERS announced a couple of weeks ago that he is retiring at the end of the year. We are going to miss his leadership and knowledge, especially in the area of science, technology, engineering, and math education. I will particularly miss working with him as a co-Chair of the STEM Ed Caucus. Promoting STEM Ed, and especially engineering education, is a big part of what National Engineers Week is all about.

Two weeks ago marked the 20th anniversary of National Engineers Week, and for each of the 5 years I have introduced this resolution, it seems to get more important.

□ 1445

We continue to fall behind other countries in the STEM fields, with China seemingly poised to overtake us as the leading producer of knowledge within a decade. Our infrastructure continues to languish, and we face serious energy and water challenges in our country. At the same time, we face an urgent need to create jobs.

If we want to solve these problems, any of these problems, we need engineers. Of course, engineers build bridges and airplanes, but they also are the ones who design our computer networks and turn new discoveries into products, industries, and jobs. The more than 2 million engineers in the U.S. have helped make our country great, but we need more of them, and we need to recognize the contributions they have made and continue to make to our Nation.

National Engineers Week seeks to address this problem through events aimed at educating youth and fostering public awareness about the vital contributions made by engineers to our quality of life and our economic prosperity. Through programs like Future City Competition, Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, and the first robotics competition, the National Engineers Week Foundation confronts the challenge of encouraging more students to pursue careers in engineering. Engineering Week comprises numerous events like the ones I just mentioned.

Another example is students learning the value of teamwork as they work in

groups to create creative and practical solutions to some of the most important problems facing our Nation and the world. Projects like designing future cities make engineering come alive for students, planting a seed that can lead to further studies or a career in engineering. In fact, research shows our children's early experience with science and engineering are a stronger prediction of long-lasting interest in science fields than aptitude tests. By drawing upon volunteers throughout country, Engineers Week reaches thousands of parents, teachers, and students, exposing them to the excitement of engineering in a real and tangible way.

I can attest that my own childhood experiences with science and engineering captivated me. As I grew up, I was always fascinated with the way things work. I remember going to the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago. Touring the coal mine and watching the model trains run over this enormous track layout that they had were two of my favorite activities. These exhibits excited and captivated me. Most importantly, though, I remember the teachers in school who helped mold this childhood fascination into an interest in engineering. All these experiences instilled in me the knowledge, confidence, and intellectual curiosity needed to pursue an undergraduate degree in mechanical engineering at Northwestern University, and a master's degree in systems engineering at Stanford.

One of the central goals of National Engineers Week is to provide this kind of inspiration, inspiration that I had as a child, to inspire the next generation of students. We desperately need these students, since it's projected that by 2012, about 46 percent of all engineering jobs could become vacant due to retirement by the aging workforce. Educating and exciting America's youth about engineering and science needs to be a national priority. I understand personally that an engineering education is useful, no matter what someone decides to do. My education helps me understand science and technology issues, STEM education, transportation, manufacturing, and risk analysis.

But it is more than knowledge. Engineering is problem-solving. There are so many problems that we need to find solutions to, in our Nation and in the world, and engineers will be involved in finding all of these solutions.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to again thank the gentleman from Michigan, Dr. EHLERS, as well as the 27 other cosponsors of this resolution. I'd also like to thank Senator KAUFMAN for introducing a companion resolution in the Senate. Above all, I'd especially like to thank the engineers who have contributed so much to America and honor them for their commitment to continuing to better our society. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. A lot of kids in this country think that engineers

just drive trains, and it's unfortunate that that's true. But this bill, recognizing the work of engineers, is so important. Our service academies have big engineering departments—in all of our military service academies. In my own field of medicine, it's engineers in the medical field that create a lot of the new products that have helped save lives in America and has helped us have the best health care system in the world.

Bringing forth the idea of educating the American public to the importance of engineering, I think, is extremely valuable. We need to encourage our kids to consider careers in engineering because we owe, in our economy and in our society, a tremendous amount not only to those engineers that drive the trains around and help deliver the goods that we need throughout the country, but the other engineers that go to great lengths to help improve our lives and have made America the greatest Nation in the world for our innovation and our technology. And it's engineers that we owe just a tremendous debt of gratitude to for what they do for this society.

So I'm very eager to see this legislation pass. I'm very proud to be here on the floor managing this bill. And I encourage all of our Members to support this legislation so that young men and women across this Nation can understand the importance of engineering—that all of society can—and will help to develop interest in the engineering field so that young men and women will go into engineering so we can continue with the design and innovation that has made this country great and will continue the greatness of America.

With that, I congratulate Mr. LIPINSKI and my good friend, Dr. EHLERS, for this legislation. I ask all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WU. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to agree with my good friend and colleague from Georgia that America does indeed, does indeed, have the best care system in the world, if you can pay for it. And the great struggle in which we find ourselves today is the challenge of coming together—of coming together to help all Americans be able to pay for their health care. And I want to thank my friend for his service as a physician and as a Member of this body.

I also want to thank Dr. EHLERS, a Ph.D. and physicist, for his service in this body. We have worked on many issues together in a bipartisan fashion because these tend to be the issues which come before the Science and Technology Committee. For years, I was his ranking member and he was the chairman. For a few years, I was the chairman and he was my ranking member. It did not matter who was playing which role in our agreement or, quite frankly, in our disagreement. But we were always honest about it,

and we were able to work together for the public good. Dr. EHLERS, VERN, thank you for your public service.

Today, I hope that my parents are actually watching C-SPAN because they are both research engineers. At a certain level, I remain concerned that they still regret that I left science and technology, first for law, and now for what I'll call public service. When I was here on this floor being sworn in, I can remember seeing them right there. And what was going through my head was, You know, I wonder if my dad is still angry that I left science and technology. He cares about it, and my mom does also, because they realize that engineering is hard and that it's important. Recognition in this resolution today is appropriate because it recognizes that engineering is hard.

All of us can remember that when we went through college, the engineers took these classes where they worked really, really hard, and they got three credits for it. We took some other things that weren't quite as hard, and we got five credits for it. So it is a difficult thing for a student, and it remains challenging as a young professional. I think that this body and this Nation should recognize and celebrate those things which are hard, at least in part just because they are hard. We should do some things because they are hard; we should do more of. That is the American way—to work your way through, to earn your way through, to step up to the challenge.

Today, we take a small step with this resolution of recognition. I ask that all Members support H.R. 1097.

I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding a moment.

I was just sitting here thinking, I'm sure Mr. Wu's parents are extremely proud of him, and he can tell them that he is engaged in engineering. He's engaged in policy engineering and social engineering here in the U.S. House of Representatives. And I'm proud that he's my friend. We have a great time in Science and Technology because we can work together and can put personalities aside. Mr. Wu has been just a phenomenal friend and member of this committee, and I congratulate him. I'm sure the Wu family is extremely proud of him, even though he's not in technical engineering. He's involved in some kind of engineering here in another form today.

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman. I am concerned about my dad. I think my mom realizes that I'm doing my best, and I'm just trying to keep science and technology and engineering well funded through this committee.

Mr. HARE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1097, a resolution recognizing National Engineers Week and the great contributions of engineers across this nation. From increasing energy efficiency to designing world-class skyscrapers to launching the space shuttle, engineers have paved the way for American progress. Our modern

society exists as a testament to their commitment to invention, imagination and scientific wonder. Engineers have written the pages of our history while also plotting the direction of our future. National Engineers Week recognizes the accomplishments of America's engineers and promotes a new generation of discovery.

Today, engineers are tackling the largest issues of our time. For example, Argonne National Laboratory, located in my home state of Illinois, is working with government, industry and international partners to provide nuclear energy that is safe, dependable and environmentally manageable. Educational institutions such as the Engineering Department at Western Illinois University have nurtured creativity and leadership among its students for decades. Western's reputation for excellence has drawn students from around the world and has produced not only fine engineers but also extraordinary leaders of business and science.

Among the many reasons I joined the Congressional Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, S.T.E.M., Education Caucus was to promote ingenuity among the bright minds of the American people. Engineering is a key component to providing the solutions our nation needs to take on the challenges that lie ahead. I am proud to tout the impressive engineering feats that have taken place throughout my district in both the public and private sectors of West Central Illinois. I hope to continue working with my colleagues on the S.T.E.M. Education Caucus to craft bipartisan, pro-engineering legislation to boost America to the forefront of global competitiveness once more.

America's future is only bound by our imagination. The imagination and innovation of America's engineers will continue to promote the growth and development of America, ensuring that our future will have no limit. Engineers have not only contributed to our stride in science and technology, but to our economy, our culture and our lives.

Madam Speaker, I commend my colleague from Illinois, Representative DANIEL LIPINSKI for introducing this worthy resolution which merits congressional action. I invite all of our colleagues to recognize National Engineers Week so that we may honor their contributions, past, present and future.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 1097, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Engineers Week. Throughout my career at the local, State and Federal level, I have worked with engineers in Oregon and around the country on some of the world's biggest challenges. From addressing climate change to creating livable communities to helping deliver clean water to poor people around the world, engineers are often the first to roll up their sleeves and build solutions.

Over the past 10 years, I have seen a revolution within the engineering community, as both companies and individuals have been playing increasingly innovative roles. Organizations such as the American Council of Engineering Companies and the American Society of Civil Engineers have done a tremendous job of educating Members of Congress and the public about the infrastructure challenges this Nation faces as well as presenting commonsense solutions. I hope they will continue to work to leverage their colleagues and their communities to make even more progress on these fronts.

Engineers are leading the charge to renew and rebuild America in an economically and environmentally sustainable way, and I am pleased that we can honor them with this resolution highlighting National Engineers Week.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I ask all Members to support the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1097.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1500

CONGRATULATING UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 747) congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 747

Whereas Forbes magazine has named the United States Military Academy at West Point as America's Best College for 2009;

Whereas U.S. News & World Report has named West Point as the Best Public Liberal Arts College in the United States;

Whereas U.S. News & World Report has consistently rated West Point's undergraduate engineering program as among the best in the United States;

Whereas the United States has had a military presence at West Point since the Revolutionary War because of its strategic position overlooking the Hudson River;

Whereas General George Washington selected Thaddeus Kosciuszko to design West Point's fortifications in 1778;

Whereas West Point is the oldest continuously occupied military post in America;

Whereas President Thomas Jefferson established the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1802;

Whereas West Point has educated many of the United States Army's commissioned officers;

Whereas West Point instructs 4,400 cadets per year in academics, military tactics, physical fitness, and leadership—all free of tuition;

Whereas 1,000 cadets graduate each year and are commissioned second lieutenants in the United States Army;

Whereas 2 Presidents of the United States, 74 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients, 88 Rhodes Scholars, 33 Marshall Scholars,

and 28 Truman Scholars have graduated from West Point;

Whereas, in addition to academics and military training, West Point offers extracurricular activities that include 115 athletic and non-sport clubs and the Eisenhower Hall Theatre; and

Whereas West Point offers a well-rounded, highly regarded education to the next generation of the Nation's leaders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009;

(2) supports West Point's mission "to educate, train, and inspire the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate is a commissioned leader of character committed to the values of Duty, Honor, Country and prepared for a career of professional excellence and service to the Nation as an officer in the United States Army"; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit a copy of this resolution for appropriate display to the Superintendent of West Point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to support House Resolution 747, which was introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL), which honors the recent accomplishments of the United States Military Academy at West Point for being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009. I would like to thank my friend and colleague from New York (Mr. HALL), who is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for authoring this resolution and bringing it to the House floor.

The tradition of the West Point Military Academy has always been one of great achievement, and I am happy to be here today to recognize their excellence. I am particularly pleased to be here because my father and grandfather are both West Point graduates, now deceased. I should add that both Mr. HALL and myself are members of the Board of Visitors at West Point. So as you might imagine, we were pleased by the news that West Point had been named America's Best College by Forbes.

West Point has a tremendous history. Since the establishment of the academy at the direction of President Thomas Jefferson in 1802, West Point

has been educating some of our Nation's best and brightest, who have gone on to distinguished service as officers in our United States military. West Point's mission is, and I quote, "To educate, train, and inspire the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate is a commissioned leader of character committed to the values of Duty, Honor, Country, and prepared for a career of professional excellence and service to the Nation as an officer in the United States Army." This mission exceeds the scholastic aims of most academic institutions, and it reflects America's need for military leaders with integrity and a commitment to service.

West Point continues to provide exceptional education that prepares officers for their roles as future military leaders year after year. While many institutions have long traditions of academic success, few match the continued contributions West Point Military Academy graduates make year after year to their country. It is no wonder that two Presidents of the United States, 74 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients, 88 Rhodes Scholars, 33 Marshall Scholars, and 28 Truman Scholars have graduated from West Point.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 747, congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on being named by Forbes magazine as America's Best College for 2009. I want to commend Representative JOHN HALL of New York for sponsoring this legislation.

As our history shows us, West Point has a tradition of excellence that began with its establishment in 1802. For more than 200 years, our Nation in peace and war has been made a better place by the excellence of the leaders produced by the Military Academy. This most recent recognition of West Point by Forbes magazine is just the latest indication that the tradition of excellence continues.

For those of us whose duty it is in the House to be in close contact with Military Academy graduates, this recognition by Forbes magazine comes as no surprise. We are reminded frequently of the professional excellence and commitment to this Nation that West Point graduates consistently demonstrate. Those qualities in and of themselves are reason enough that we should remain supportive of this institution that has traditionally and consistently inspired young men and women to live such lives. I urge all Members to support this worthy resolution.

Madam Speaker, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he

may consume to Mr. HALL of New York, who is the author of this resolution. He is also a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and chairs the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. He is a great Member of Congress, and he is also a great member of the Board of Visitors at West Point.

Mr. HALL of New York. Thank you, Mr. MARSHALL, and thank you, Mr. JONES, for your kind words of support of my legislation, House Resolution 747. Thank you as well to Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member MCKEON for bringing this legislation through the Armed Services Committee to the House floor.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 747 recognizes the achievement of the United States Military Academy at West Point for being named Forbes magazine's best college in 2009. Not best military academy, but best college overall. In fact, the headline on the front of that issue of Forbes said, "Why West Point Beats Harvard." And I think it is something that many of us don't realize, that not only is the academy turning out exemplary officers who will serve this country with great creativity and loyalty and imagination and energy, but they are turning out well-rounded students who know about a variety of very important subjects that are taught as well or better at that school as at any public or private university in the country.

I have the honor of representing West Point in the 19th Congressional District of New York, and the 4,400 cadets who make up the student body at the United States Military Academy. I also have the honor, along with my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), of serving on the West Point Board of Visitors.

The Forbes rankings were based on evaluations of students, the success of the graduates of the school, and on the average debt incurred by graduates. It is a great tribute to the caliber of the cadets, the faculty, and the administration of West Point to be ranked with and now above the other great institutions of higher learning in this country based on these important criteria.

Graduates of West Point have served their Nation with the highest level of skill, honor, and devotion for more than 200 years. More than 70 West Point grads have received the Medal of Honor for their service to our country. Each of the senior commanding generals in Iraq and Afghanistan are alumni. And 74 West Point graduates have given their lives in Afghanistan and Iraq.

West Point's cadets fully embody the academy's motto, "Duty, Honor, Country." West Point is a national treasure and a jewel of the Hudson Valley, where today's heroes and tomorrow's leaders are trained. I am proud of their accomplishments and pleased that they have gotten the recognition that they

have earned. I am especially proud of my nephew, who will be one of the graduates of the class of 2010.

I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting H. Res. 747.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a West Point graduate himself.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I am honored to come to the floor with my good friend, Congressman JONES, and also two members of the Board of Visitors, Congressman HALL, who also represents that area, and Congressman MARSHALL, who served honorably in the Vietnam conflict and is a great friend. They both serve on the Board of Visitors, which I have recently been named on. I look forward to doing the job I guess next week, when we meet to continue the job.

Congressman MARSHALL did mention the mission of the United States Military Academy, which is, "To educate, train, and inspire the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate is a commissioned leader of character committed to the values of Duty, Honor, Country, and prepared for a career of professional excellence and service to the Nation as an officer of the United States Army."

As was noted, I graduated in 1980. I had many of my classmates who are major commanders and leaders in the areas of battle today. The number one responsibility of the Federal Government is the protection of our citizens. We do that by having a standing military. We have learned that the importance of having a professional military force is critical. Thomas Jefferson learned that and instituted the development of the United States Military Academy in 1802. The important thing that Thomas Jefferson did that was different, though, was he focused on raising the professional military Army out of the regular citizens of our country, thus developing this process of which we nominate and we accept. So that it is not an elite from the elite, but it is a perspective of all Americans.

Every young man or woman who achieves good grades, are kids of character, strong moral conviction, athletically fit and sound can compete for this opportunity for an education, which has been noted by the magazine article. But they do it for more than just a good education, because it is at great risk. Because what they have agreed to do is serve their country. And that is not a small decision to make in this environment.

I would like to submit for the RECORD since the global war on terror, since September 11, 2001, a list of those West Pointers who fell in the line of duty.

Lieutenant Colonel (Ret.) William E. Bowers USMA 1979
Colonel James W. Harrison, Jr.,
U.S. Army USMA 1981

Lieutenant Colonel Dominic R. Baragona, U.S. Army USMA 1982
Colonel Brian D. Allgood, U.S. Army USMA 1982
Colonel Theodore S. Westhusing, U.S. Army USMA 1983
Lieutenant Colonel Michael J. McMahon, U.S. Army USMA 1985
Mr. Douglas B. Gurian USMA 1986
Lieutenant Colonel Paul J. Finken, U.S. Army USMA 1989
Lieutenant Colonel James J. Walton, U.S. Army USMA 1989
Major Curtis D. Feistner, U.S. Army USMA 1990
Major William F. Hecker III, U.S. Army USMA 1991
Major Guy Barattieri, U.S. Army USMA 1992
Major Stephen C. Reich, U.S. Army USMA 1993
Major Jason E. George, U.S. Army USMA 1994
Captain Bartt D. Owens, U.S. Army USMA 1994
Captain James F. Adamowski, U.S. Army USMA 1995
Captain John F. Kurth, U.S. Army USMA 1995
Captain Joshua T. Byers, U.S. Army USMA 1996
Captain Matthew J. August, U.S. Army USMA 1997
Captain Philip T. Esposito, U.S. Army USMA 1997
Captain Michael J. MacKinnon, U.S. Army USMA 1997
Captain Mark C. Paine, U.S. Army USMA 1997
Captain Eric T. Paliwoda, U.S. Army USMA 1997
Captain Ian P. Weikel, U.S. Army USMA 1997
Captain Nathan S. Dalley, U.S. Army USMA 1998
Captain Stephen W. Frank, U.S. Army USMA 1998
Captain Ralph J. Harting III, U.S. Army USMA 1998
Captain Christopher B. Johnson, U.S. Army USMA 1998
Captain Dennis L. Pintor, U.S. Army USMA 1998
Captain David A. Boris, U.S. Army USMA 1999
Captain Douglas A. Dicenzo, U.S. Army USMA 1999
Captain Brian S. Freeman, U.S. Army USMA 1999
Captain Benedict J. Smith, U.S. Army USMA 1999
Captain Corry P. Tyler, U.S. Army USMA 1999
First Lieutenant Leif E. Nott, U.S. Army USMA 2000
Captain Benjamin D. Tiffner, U.S. Army USMA 2000
First Lieutenant David R. Bernstein, U.S. Army USMA 2001
Captain John L. Hallett III, U.S. Army USMA 2001
Captain Andrew R. Houghton, U.S. Army USMA 2001
Captain Joe F. Lusk II, U.S. Army USMA 2001
Captain Andrew R. Pearson, U.S. Army USMA 2001
First Lieutenant Michael R. Adams, U.S. Army USMA 2002
First Lieutenant Todd Bryant, U.S. Army USMA 2002
Captain Brian M. Bunting, U.S. Army USMA 2002
Captain Mark A. Garner, U.S. Army USMA 2002
Captain James M. Gurbisz, U.S. Army USMA 2002
Captain Drew N. Jensen, U.S. Army USMA 2002
First Lieutenant Kevin J. Smith, U.S. Army USMA 2002

Captain Torre R. Mallard, U.S. Army USMA 2002
 Captain Timothy J. Moshier, U.S. Army USMA 2002
 Second Lieutenant Leonard M. Cowherd, U.S. Army USMA 2003
 First Lieutenant Derek S. Hines, U.S. Army USMA 2003
 Captain Rhett W. Schiller, U.S. Army USMA 2003
 First Lieutenant Laura M. Walker, U.S. Army USMA 2003
 First Lieutenant Garrison C. Avery, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 First Lieutenant Benjamin T. Britt, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 First Lieutenant Amos "Camden" R. Bock, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 Captain Michael A. Cerrone, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 Captain John R. Dennison, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 Captain David M. Fraser, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 Captain Paul W. Pena, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 First Lieutenant Robert A. Seidel III, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 Captain Adam P. Snyder, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 Captain Daniel P. Whitten, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 First Lieutenant Dennis W. Zilinski, U.S. Army USMA 2004
 First Lieutenant Jonathan W. Edds, U.S. Army USMA 2005
 First Lieutenant Matthew C. Ferrara, U.S. Army USMA 2005
 First Lieutenant Jacob N. Fritz, U.S. Army USMA 2005
 First Lieutenant Thomas M. Martin, U.S. Army USMA 2005
 First Lieutenant Phillip I. Neel, U.S. Army USMA 2005
 Second Lieutenant Emily J. T. Perez, U.S. Army USMA 2005
 First Lieutenant Timothy W. Cunningham USMA 2006
 First Lieutenant Nick A. Dewhirst, U.S. Army USMA 2006
 Second Lieutenant Michael R. Girdano, U.S. Army USMA 2007
 First Lieutenant Daniel B. Hyde, U.S. Army USMA 2007
 First Lieutenant Tyler E. Parten, U.S. Army USMA 2007.

Notably, there are three from the class of 2007 so far in this campaign. So these are real patriots and these are young men and women who since the attacks—in fact, if you are at the academy and you go out to Lake Frederick and climb up on the hill and get on one of the old fire stands, you can see the outlines of New York City. And when I was there as a young man, you could see at that time the World Trade Center, which is no more.

West Point still inspires dedication, commitment, and young men and women who want to serve their country at a great institution of higher learning, being prepared to put their lives on the line in the defense of their country.

So I appreciate this time just to highlight what we do at West Point, but also at our other academies, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy—that is hard for me to say—Coast Guard Academy, Merchant Marine Academy. And we want to make sure that all our young men and women know that they have a great opportunity to serve their country, the best

one being at West Point. And I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that commitment to excellence continues for many years to come.

I thank my colleague for giving me the time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the words of Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate his service. I hope everybody takes those words to heart.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MARSHALL for recognizing me for this period of time.

I want to recognize Mr. HALL for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor and for his service to the congressional district which includes West Point, and Mr. JONES on the Republican side, who has been a good friend and colleague.

I have always taken pride in sending good young people to the service academies, including West Point. And now I can say that for those who are going to West Point that Forbes has selected your institution as the finest college in America in 2009. I do believe, though, that these young people who go to our service academies are there not only to get a great education, they are there for service, and the highest kind of public service, because it puts them at great personal risk.

My first recollection of visiting West Point was at the age of 8. At that point I was an immigrant child. I am not sure that I knew English completely, but I could read well enough to read the stone, that not too large stone there that has a very large phrase on it: "Duty, Honor, Country," the words that the United States military has lived by, under civilian leadership, for over 200 years. And I want to honor that long gray line that I saw in 1962. I just also wonder whether those academy graduates from the class of '63 or '64, whether there are any left in active service, and perhaps they would be a four-star today.

□ 1515

There is a long line of service. Thank you very much, Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. HALL, for bringing this resolution to us.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I just want to briefly thank Mr. HALL and everyone who has spoken today.

I do not know a bigger thrill for me, as a congressman, when I call a young person in my district, whom I have nominated to one of the three academies, to tell them to expect a letter of appointment. It is a thrill that every time I make the call, every time it is a thrill.

I want to thank Mr. HALL for this resolution today and also Mr. MARSHALL and those who have spoken.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, earlier this year, the President made an announcement concerning troop buildup, the proposed plan where Af-

ghanistan is concerned and the plan to increase the presence of American soldiers there. He made the announcement in Eisenhower Hall at West Point. I was privileged, along with Mr. HALL and a few other Members of Congress, to attend that. I was really struck by the fact that the Commander in Chief, our President, was talking to thousands of young men and women, some of whom, for sure, will wind up being injured, protecting our country in Afghanistan.

I am wearing my infantry tie today. I have my CIB on. I had the privilege of having a couple years of service back during the Vietnam War. And I say it's a privilege, and I view it that way. People will often say to me, Thank you for your service. And sometimes I will respond, You don't really need to thank me. I got more out of this than I gave.

I encourage all young Americans to think about attending one of our academies. West Point has received its recognition as the best college in the United States, but all of the academies give wonderful educations, and they give you a wonderful opportunity to serve. It almost certainly will wind up being the most extraordinary thing that you do during your lifetime should you choose to go through one of the academies and then serve in our military. That's certainly the case where I am concerned, and I have done a lot of things in my life.

The most extraordinary time in my life was when I was in service, particularly when I was in combat. So I thank the country for having given me that opportunity. And if you're a kid and you are thinking about college, you ought to think about our service academies. You not only get a great education, but you have an opportunity to serve in a way that you will not be able to serve in any other capacity in this country, and you will really feel good about it if you do it well.

So I thank Mr. JONES. He is a great member of the Armed Services Committee, a great Member of this Congress, and a real supporter of the military.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 747.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING 139TH AIRLIFT WING

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the resolution (H. Res. 699) expressing the appreciation of Congress for the service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing, Air National Guard, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 699

Whereas the 139th Airlift Wing (AW), Air National Guard has its roots in the formation of the 180th Bombardment Squadron (Light), which was one of the first federally recognized Air National Guard units in the United States;

Whereas the 180th Bombardment Squadron deployed in support of the Korean War in December 1951;

Whereas in 1976, the unit was redesignated as the 139th Tactical Airlift Group (TAG);

Whereas in 1990, the 139th TAG assisted in troop deployment during Operation Desert Storm;

Whereas in 1992, the unit was redesignated the 139th Airlift Group (AG);

Whereas, between 1992 and 1996, the 139th AG supported humanitarian operations in Bosnia, Sarajevo, Africa, and Haiti;

Whereas in 1995, the unit officially became known as the 139th Airlift Wing;

Whereas, between 1998 and 2004, the 139th AW supported military operations alongside North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces as part of Operation Joint Forge in Europe;

Whereas in 2002, the 139th AW deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan;

Whereas in 2005, the 139th AW assisted with disaster relief efforts in response to Hurricane Katrina;

Whereas in December 2007, the 139th AW was enlisted to support efforts in response to a devastating ice storm that struck Northwest Missouri; and

Whereas the 139th AW hosts the renowned Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center (AATTC);

Whereas NATO air forces utilize the AATTC in support of training operations;

Whereas in 2008, the Headquarters United States Air Force General Officers' Steering Committee approved a Total Force Integration Initiative designating the AATTC as a blended unit of Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, and Regular Air Force members;

Whereas in 2008, the AATTC was designated the Mobility Air Forces Tactics Center of Excellence;

Whereas nearly 2,500 civilians and military personnel from Northwest Missouri and Northeast Kansas serve selflessly in the 139th AW: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the exemplary service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing and their families; and

(2) commends the members of the 139th AW and their families (and all of the other members of the Armed Forces who have served, or who are currently serving, in support of United States military contingency operations) for their service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARSHALL. I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 699, recognizing the service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing of the Air National Guard. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), for bringing this resolution before the House.

Units of the Air National Guard play a critical role in America's wars and major contingencies as well as provide valuable assistance to their States in times of crisis. I'm extraordinarily proud of Georgia's Air National Guard and the 116th blended wing that's housed at Robins Air Force Base. The 139th Airlift Wing has roots in one of the federally recognized Air National Guard units in the United States, and it continues to be an important part of defense efforts at home and abroad.

The unit deployed in support Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and assisted in troop deployment during Operation Desert Storm. In the 1990s, the 139th supported humanitarian operations in Bosnia, Sarajevo, Africa, and Haiti. In addition to their efforts overseas, in 2005, they assisted with disaster relief efforts in response to Hurricane Katrina. Today, thousands of civilian and military personnel from northwest Missouri and northeast Kansas serve selflessly in the unit.

The 139th Airlift Wing provides essential support to maintenance and growth of the armed services. The unit is home to the Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center that trains U.S. airlift crews and support personnel as well as NATO air forces in advanced tactics training.

House Resolution 699 recognizes the dedication and courage of not only the members of the 139th Airlift Wing and their families and service to the Nation, but also all of the members of the Armed Forces who have served or are currently serving in support of the United States military contingency operations. All our servicemembers and their families deserve our deepest gratitude and respect.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifices of the 139th Airlift Wing by supporting House Resolution 699.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 699, which recognizes the service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing, Missouri Air National Guard. I want to commend my friend

SAM GRAVES of Missouri for sponsoring this legislation.

The 139th Airlift Wing is a remarkably diverse and capable unit. For example, one of its major subordinate units is the Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center. That unit exemplifies the total force concept because its members come not only from the Air National Guard but also from the Air Force Reserve and the active Air Force. They provide advanced tactical training to improve the effectiveness and suitability of airlift crews from all components of the Air Force—the Special Operations Command, the Marine Corps, and 15 allied nations.

Members of the wing have deployed in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, to include providing the security element for a Missouri agribusiness development team that returned last fall from a year-long mission in Afghanistan. The success of the 139th Airlift Wing is directly related to the dedication, sacrifice, and professionalism of the nearly 2,500 civilian and military personnel who carry out the unit's missions. Their efforts deserve our recognition and thanks. For that reason, I urge all Members to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) who introduced this resolution.

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, last July I was humbled and honored to introduce House Resolution 699, expressing the appreciation of Congress for the service and sacrifice of the members of the 139th Airlift Wing, Missouri Air National Guard. Since World War II, the men and women of the 139th have been based at Rosecrans Memorial Airport in St. Joseph, Missouri, which is in my district.

First, I want to thank Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member MCKEON for allowing this important resolution to come to the floor today. And further, I want to thank my colleagues who joined me in cosponsoring this resolution and helping move forward such an important tribute. I would also like to recognize the 139th Airlift Wing's commanders—at least those whom I have been able to work with—General Steven McCamy, Colonel Davenport, General Stephen Cotter, and, most recently, the new commander, Colonel Mike McEnulty. Colonel McEnulty has been a dynamic leader in working to continue and expand the role of the Missouri Air National Guard, and he is an invaluable resource to my office, our military, and, obviously, the St. Joseph community.

The 139th Airlift Wing, initially designated as the 180th Bombardment Squadron, has been serving our Nation proudly since 1946, which makes it one of the first federally recognized Air National Guard units in the Nation. They have deployed, and it has already been pointed out, they have deployed and supported the Korean War, Operation Desert Storm, military operations

alongside NATO forces as part of Operation Joint Forge in Europe, and Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. And the members of the 139th Airlift Wing have also assisted with humanitarian efforts in response to the great flood of 1993, Hurricane Katrina, severe storms that struck northwest Missouri in 2007, and most recently in response to the devastating earthquake in Haiti.

In 1984, the 139th Airlift Wing became home to the Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center, which some have already pointed out today. The Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center increases the warfighting effectiveness and the survivability of mobility forces in a combat environment and is utilized by our military and NATO forces from around the world. It is used by Reserve units and active duty units.

It's always interesting, whenever I have the opportunity to travel abroad, whether it's to Afghanistan or to Iraq, a lot of times Members of Congress would travel with C-17 crews or C-130 crews, and one of the things I always ask them is if they've been through the school at St. Joe, and 80 percent of the time they say, yes, they have. They've been to the Advanced Airlift Tactics Training Center, which has taught them survivability in those areas.

Lastly, I want to express my sincere gratitude to the nearly 2,500 civilian and military personnel from northwest Missouri and northeast Kansas which serve selflessly in the 139th Airlift Wing. I commend their exemplary service and sacrifice and that of their families and that of all other members of the Armed Forces who have served, who are currently serving and are supporting the United States military contingency operations at home and abroad.

Madam Speaker, please join me in thanking the men and women of the 139th Airlift Wing by supporting this important resolution.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I certainly hope that the House will support House Resolution 699.

I just want to take this opportunity, on behalf of all members of the Armed Services Committee and all Members of the Congress, to thank the men and women of our National Guard, whatever branch, for the service that you provide this country and particularly the service that you are providing this country in our contingency operations. It's a strain on you. It's a strain on your families, and we're grateful. The Nation owes you. We appreciate your service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 699, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING MILITARY WORKING DOG PROGRAM

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 812) recognizing the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog (MWD) Program to the United States Armed Forces, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 812

Whereas the Military Working Dog Program, or K-9 Corps, was developed in 1942, shortly after the United States entered World War II;

Whereas all four branches of the United States Armed Forces as well as other government agencies, including the Secret Service, Central Intelligence Agency, and Transportation Security Administration, use Military Working Dogs in service to the country;

Whereas Military Working Dogs are trained in explosive detection, narcotic detection, sentry, patrol, tracking, and other specific areas;

Whereas Military Working Dogs, through their training, have prevented injuries and saved the lives of thousands of United States citizens;

Whereas more than 19,000 Military Working Dogs were acquired by the United States Armed Forces during World War II and of those 19,000, a little more than 10,000 Military Working Dogs were utilized in the war effort;

Whereas more than 1,500 Military Working Dogs were employed during the Korean War and 4,500 in the Vietnam War;

Whereas, since September 11, 2001, Military Working Dogs have served in Iraq and Afghanistan and have been employed in detection work as part of homeland security and defense efforts;

Whereas today approximately 2,000 Military Working Dogs serve at nearly 170 United States military bases worldwide, including bases in 40 States and 3 United States territories;

Whereas retired Military Working Dogs are recognized for their lifetime of service in the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas charitable organizations and community groups are recognized for their work in coordination with the Department of Defense to help bring Military Working Dogs stationed overseas home to the United States for adoption when their active duty days are over and provide support to active K9 military teams worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces;

(2) honors active and retired Military Working Dogs for their loyal service and dedication to protecting the men and women of the United States Armed Forces; and

(3) supports the adoption and care of these quality animals after their service is over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARSHALL. I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 812, recognizing the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces. I would like to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for bringing this measure before the House.

Military working dogs contribute essential services to our Armed Forces through their capacity to detect explosives, illegal narcotics, and unwarranted persons beyond the capacity of any human patrol. They offer an invaluable ability for tracking missing people as well as fleeing suspects. Their support with sentry is crucial for the protection of our soldiers and civilians, and they are vital in so many different roles. Our military would not be as effective without them.

Military working dogs serve the four branches of the military, the Secret Service, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Transportation Security Administration. Their service has developed and expanded since their implementation in 1942 during World War II and has since played important roles overseas in Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

□ 1530

The Military Working Dog Program has increased its role in safeguarding our homeland. Since September 11, 2001, our expanded homeland and defense efforts would not be as effective if it were not for the expanded effort of the Military Working Dog Program. Thousands of dogs serve every year both in the United States and around the world, and I am glad to be here today in honor of their service.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 812, which recognizes the significant contribution of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces. Dogs have long been known as man's best friend. They are brave, loyal, and trustworthy. It is not a coincidence that these are the same traits so valued by the United States military services. It is these qualities that have made our Armed Forces unsurpassed. It is no wonder that the natural bond between man and dogs and these shared

characteristics have made military working dogs vital to the success of our Armed Forces since the K-9 Corps was established during World War II.

Prior to the Second World War, the only dogs employed by the military were sled dogs used by the Army in Alaska. War dogs, as they were called in World War II, were trained to be sentry dogs, scouts or patrol dogs, messenger dogs, and mine-detection dogs. Today, military working dogs provide critical services in explosives and narcotics detection, sentry, patrol, and tracking, not only to the military services but to the Secret Service, Central Intelligence Agency, and the Transportation Security Administration.

Currently there are over 2,000 military working dogs serving at military bases throughout the world. Over 250 are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan alongside our troops fighting to rid the world of tyranny and terrorism. These dogs are credited with saving countless American and coalition lives by their actions and are recognized as a true force multiplier and enabler.

Sadly, military working dogs experience the same hardships and horrors of combat as the men and women they work to protect, including paying the ultimate price with their lives. Since the beginning of the program, hundreds of dogs have been killed in action, 281 in the Vietnam War alone.

On a brighter note, Madam Speaker, today's military working dogs are retired after their lifetime of military service. With the help of the countless charitable and community agencies working with the Department of Defense, these dogs are placed for adoption after their active duty service is over. They bring joy to their adoptive families and serve as ambassadors for the Military Working Dog Program.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for introducing this resolution to recognize the extraordinary military working dogs. I join him and all of my colleagues to honor these incredible dogs and their military handlers and to support adoption of military working dogs who have served this Nation so well. I therefore strongly urge all Members to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman who introduced this legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I rise today as the proud sponsor of House Resolution 812, legislation to honor and recognize the significant contributions made by military working dogs to the United States military and to our Nation.

Dogs have been used by people to help protect themselves and their property since ancient times. Trained dogs have been used by most of the world's military forces since the first military units were organized. From these ancient beginnings, the U.S. Armed

Forces adopted the Military Working Dog Program, called "the K-9 Corps," shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, when dog owners across the Nation donated their noble pets to assist soldiers and sailors in the World War II effort.

Since that time, military working dog training has been continually refined to produce a highly sophisticated and versatile extension of the warrior's own senses. Military working dogs are trained in explosives detection, narcotics detection, sentry, patrol, tracking, and other specific areas. Even the most complex machines remain unable to duplicate the operational effectiveness of properly trained working dogs.

The branches of the United States Armed Forces as well as several other governmental agencies incorporate military working dogs into their operations, including, as has been mentioned, the Secret Service, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Transportation Security Administration.

The United States military utilized more than 10,000 dogs in World War II. More than 1,500 military working dogs were employed during the Korean War, and 4,500 in the Vietnam War. Since September 11, military working dogs have served not only in Iraq and Afghanistan but also in detection work as part of homeland security and defense efforts. Approximately 2,000 military working dogs currently serve at nearly 170 U.S. military bases worldwide, including bases in 40 U.S. States and three U.S. territories. Over the past six decades, these dogs have helped prevent injuries and have saved the lives of thousands of Americans.

This resolution to honor these brave canines was inspired by a military working dog that was adopted by a family in Fleming, New Jersey, in my congressional district. Military Working Dog Ben C020 was retired from the Air Force last July after nearly 11 years of loyal service in the military. Ben, trained as a narcotics and patrol dog, served with a security unit at Bolling Air Force Base. As the premium narcotics dog in the unit, he was selected to deploy to Texas to assist the United States Customs and Border Protection agency, where he detected and prevented 300 pounds of marijuana from being smuggled into the U.S. in one month. Ben also worked in law enforcement, foot patrols, and resource security to keep employees, residents, and visitors at the Air Force base safe. In September, the Air Force awarded Ben with a medal of commendation to recognize the major achievements that he has achieved throughout his career.

House Resolution 812 also recognizes community organizations for their efforts to assist in the adoption process of retired military working dogs. J.T. Gabriel, a constituent of mine and Ben's new owner, is the chief executive officer and founder of K-9 Soldiers, a nonprofit organization that supports military K-9 troops worldwide. In addition to providing support for active

military working dog units, K-9 Soldiers and many other community groups work closely with the adoption program at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas to help secure a home for military working dogs once they retire. Thanks to their efforts, hundreds of retired military working dogs have been able to find good homes and continue to lead happy and healthy lives after their years of loyal service to the Nation.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for allowing us to bring this resolution to the floor, and the Members who are cosponsors of House Resolution 812. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution and honor the thousands of active and retired military working dogs that have helped save lives and protected the members of our Armed Forces in harm's way.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply observe that our very effective military dogs cannot function at all without their handlers, and so I would just like to recognize and thank those who work with these dogs and make them all they can be. The dogs are very important to security efforts by our Armed Forces, and without their handlers and the general support they receive from others, they would not be effective at all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 812 recognizing the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces, and I thank my good friend from New Jersey for bringing forth this resolution.

As my colleagues have stated, military working dogs have served side by side with the brave men and women protecting our Nation. They serve as loyal companions in combat and beyond to their handlers. Many of these working dogs serve on the front lines as bomb sniffing dogs, detecting explosives and other threats, but also working narcotics detection, patrols, and even as sentries, alerting our brave soldiers when they are in danger.

Back in 2005, then Air Force Tech Sergeant Jamie Dana and her military working dog Rex were traveling in a convoy in Kirkuk, Iraq, after searching several villages for explosives. Rex, a 5-year old, 80-pound German shepherd, had been working with Dana for more than 3 years. Returning to base that evening, her Humvee was hit by an improvised explosive device. Dana was the most badly injured in the convoy, and was rushed to the operating room by helicopter, continuously asking if Rex had survived the blast.

"My heart was broken," Dana said. "He was my best friend. Rex and I were

together 24/7, and my life was in his hands, just as his life was in mine. I thought he was dead."

Dana then went through several surgeries and defied the odds, continuing to improve and get better. During her recovery at Walter Reed, she awoke one day to find a big surprise: Rex was there, alive, with little more than a slight burn on his nose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Dana's best friend, Rex, was alive. However, the reunion was short-lived as Rex was scheduled to be brought back into service.

Growing up in Smethport, Pennsylvania, in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, Dana has always loved animals, especially dogs and horses. During her recovery, she repeatedly asked to adopt Rex. However, she was not allowed to keep him until Congress, recognizing the importance of military working dogs, passed a measure that would allow certain exceptions for wounded veterans. Tech Sergeant Dana and others put their lives on the line every day in defense of this country, but so do their dogs. Their activities have truly touched the lives of so many, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution honoring military working dogs.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I would think it is appropriate that I might say to everyone who has spoken today, thank you for your comments, but also I would like to share that the House has passed legislation that would allow a war dog memorial to be built at no expense to the taxpayer, either the building of the memorial or the upkeep. With that I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia, it is a pleasure to work with you. You are one of the gentlemen who I have a greatest respect for in this House for your integrity.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina saying that since he is widely viewed in the House as being nothing but integrity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 812, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Recognizing the significant contributions of the Military Working Dog Program to the United States Armed Forces."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

RECOGNIZING LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1072) recognizing Louisiana State University for 150 years of service and excellence in higher education, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1072

Whereas classes began at Louisiana State University, formerly named Seminary of Learning of the State of Louisiana, on January 2, 1860;

Whereas Louisiana State University is the flagship institution of the State of Louisiana, and is a land-grant, sea-grant, and space-grant institution;

Whereas Louisiana State University developed seven institutions of higher learning in the State of Louisiana so that educational opportunities would be available to the far reaches of the state;

Whereas Louisiana State University has instituted the "Pelican Promise" program providing financial assistance to the neediest of students so that they may receive the benefits of higher education;

Whereas Louisiana State University is designated a Research University by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and performs research for the benefit of the United States and the State of Louisiana;

Whereas Louisiana State University has 650 endowed chairs and professorships held by distinguished faculty in the comprehensive disciplines that support the economy, culture, policy, and scientific prosperity of the State;

Whereas Louisiana State University offers degrees in 72 baccalaureate programs, 78 master's programs, and 53 doctoral programs and has awarded more than 100,000 degrees since the institution's inception;

Whereas Louisiana State University administers 11 intercollegiate women's sports teams and 9 men's sports teams, and the "Tigers" have won 46 national championships, including 25 championships won by the women's track and field team;

Whereas Louisiana State University has answered the call to service whether it be officers for military service or operating the Nation's largest field hospital in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina; and

Whereas Louisiana State University has provided a quality education, basic and applicable research, service to its State and Nation, and brought distinction upon the State of Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes Louisiana State University for over 150 years of service and excellence in higher education, and

(2) congratulates Louisiana State University on the occasion of its 150th anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which

Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1072 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1072, which celebrates Louisiana State University for 150 years of service and leadership in higher education.

Founded in 1860 as a seminary school and a military academy, the university has grown to educate more than 26,000 students annually, including more than 1,400 international students and over 4,000 graduate students. The students and faculty, past and present, guide LSU to its current standing as the flagship public university of the State of Louisiana.

LSU's dedication in the classroom is matched by its athletic excellence. The university fields 20 Division 1A sports teams and has earned over 46 national championships, including a recent 2009 national men's baseball championship.

LSU also demonstrates leadership and serves the communities of Louisiana. This was best exemplified by its role in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. In addition to accepting 2,300 displaced students from universities throughout the region, 3,000 LSU students volunteered to help injured Hurricane Katrina evacuees. LSU's support of the hardest hit communities in the Gulf Coast is critical to recovery, and I thank the university and its students for their service.

This year, Louisiana State University will celebrate 150 years of providing excellent education and cultivating young men and women who become local, State, and national leaders.

Madam Speaker, once again, I express my support for Louisiana State University and thank Representative CASSIDY for bringing this bill forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1072, recognizing Louisiana State University for 150 years of service and excellence in higher education.

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College had its origin in certain land grants made by the United States Government in 1806, 1811 and 1827 for use as a seminary of learning. In 1853, the Louisiana General Assembly established the Seminary of Learning of the State of Louisiana near Pineville, Louisiana. The institution opened on January 2, 1860. In 1870, the name of the institution was changed to Louisiana State University.

Today, LSU holds a prominent position in American higher education. One

of only 25 universities nationwide designated as both a land grant and a sea grant institution, it also holds the Carnegie Foundation's Doctoral Research-Extensive designation. LSU offers degrees in 71 baccalaureate programs, 78 master's programs and 53 doctoral programs, and has awarded more than 100,000 degrees since 1860. The university is a recognized research institution with over 800 sponsored research projects.

LSU not only boasts an excellent academic program; it is a powerhouse in athletics as well. It administers 11 intercollegiate women's sports teams and nine men's sports teams. The Tigers have won 43 national championships, including 25 championships won by the women's track and field team.

LSU also holds a history of civic service through its 150 years of existence. Most recently, LSU operated the Nation's largest field hospital in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. In addition, the university accepted an additional 2,300 students from the greater New Orleans area who were displaced after that disaster.

Louisiana State University is ranked 128th in the national universities category by the 2010 U.S. News & World Report ranking of U.S. colleges, 64th among public universities. Additionally U.S. News & World Report ranked LSU as the 16th most popular university in the Nation.

I extend my congratulations to Louisiana State University on its 150th anniversary and wish all its faculty, staff, students, and alumni continued success in their endeavors.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Louisiana (Mr. CAO).

Mr. CAO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in honor of Louisiana State University, which is celebrating 150 years of academic achievement and service to the State of Louisiana. This celebration marks the culmination of many goals for LSU as they reach the end of their second major capital campaign, the Forever LSU Campaign, and their academic blueprint for the future, the Flagship Agenda.

LSU has had the longstanding goal of being designated as a tier 1 university by U.S. News & World Report, and for the past 2 years LSU has achieved this ranking. For the past 25 years, however, LSU has held the highest Carnegie Foundation classification, the designation of a "very high research activity" university.

LSU is the State of Louisiana's flagship institution; and as the international leader in research, LSU is one of only 30 universities to have the great distinction of being designated as a land, sea and space-grant institution. Most recently, LSU won \$10 million in grants and contracts related to the coast, including aquaculture, erosion, subsidence, storm modeling, and social resiliency to disasters. Further, LSU is deeply rooted in tradition and boasts a

large percentage of students from the greater New Orleans area, which I represent.

Most notably and nobly for citizens of Louisiana, after Hurricane Katrina, LSU opened its doors to enroll an additional 2,700 students from the New Orleans area, and the LSU community housed thousands more. Overnight, LSU's Carl Maddox Fieldhouse became a special-needs shelter, and LSU's Pete Maravich Assembly Center became the largest acute care field hospital in American history. With 800 beds, 1,700 medical personnel from across the Nation, and thousands more volunteers working around the clock to serve and to care for all those affected by the storm, their motto became "just make it happen." It was the epitome of goodness.

I am proud to represent approximately 8,000 LSU alumni living in Orleans and Jefferson Parishes. On behalf of the citizens of Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, I want to thank the LSU community for all they did for us during and after Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The LSU community is proud of their traditions; and, today, they are and should be proud of their commitments to academic excellence and community service.

I want to congratulate my good friend, BILL CASSIDY, for bringing this important resolution to the floor. The Sixth Congressional District cannot find a more dedicated, more honorable Representative than BILL CASSIDY.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote for this resolution. Congratulations to the LSU community on its 150th anniversary.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1072, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING PENN STATE UNIVERSITY IFC/PANHELLENIC DANCE MARATHON

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1112) congratulating the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon (THON) on its continued success in

support of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1112

Whereas the Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon, known as THON, is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world, with 700 dancers, more than 300 supporting organizations, and more than 15,000 volunteers involved in the annual event;

Whereas student volunteers at the Pennsylvania State University annually collect money and dance for 46 hours straight at the Bryce Jordan Center for THON, bringing energy and excitement to campus for a mission to conquer cancer, and bringing awareness to countless thousands more;

Whereas all THON activities support the mission of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital, which provides financial and emotional support to pediatric cancer patients and their families and also funds cancer research;

Whereas each year, THON is the single largest donor to the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital, having raised nearly \$68.9 million since 1977, when the two organizations first became affiliated;

Whereas in 2010, THON set a new fundraising record of over \$7.83 million, even after the previous record of \$7.5 million was set in 2009;

Whereas THON support has helped more than 2,000 families through the Four Diamonds Fund, is currently helping to build a new Pediatric Cancer Pavilion at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital, and has helped support pediatric cancer research that has caused some pediatric cancer survival rates to increase to nearly 90 percent; and

Whereas THON has inspired similar events and organizations across the Nation, ranging from high schools to colleges and beyond, and continues to encourage students across the country to volunteer and stay involved in great charitable causes in their community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon (THON) on its continued success in support of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital; and

(2) commends the Pennsylvania State University students, volunteers and supporting organizations for their hard work putting together another recordbreaking THON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1112 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1112, which recognizes Pennsylvania State University's Dance Marathon fund-raiser for its enthusiastic continued support of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital. This is an event which was first started in 1972. It raised \$2,000 in that year, and since then has continued on an annual basis and has raised a staggering amount of money for an incredibly good cause, the Children's Hospital at the Hershey Medical Center.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), the sponsor of this resolution, is far more familiar with the history of this extraordinary effort than I am, and I would just as soon defer to him to talk about this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today, proudly, in support of House Resolution 1112, congratulating the Pennsylvania State University IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon—or THON as it's referred to at Penn State—on its continued success in support of the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital.

Pennsylvania State University, or Penn State, is a public research university founded in 1855 as the Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania. The school was renamed Pennsylvania State College in 1875, and in 1889 it became Pennsylvania State University. Today, Penn State offers 160 different majors, and over 43,000 students are enrolled at the university's main campus in State College, Pennsylvania, just miles from my home town.

Penn State has a strong reputation for its academic, athletic, and civic excellence. It is known as one of "the public ivies" and also is known for its community involvement. The Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital at the Penn State Medical Center in Hershey, Pennsylvania, is the only Children's Hospital located in south central Pennsylvania and the home of the region's only level 1 NICU. The hospital is a leader in several specialties and has ranked higher than 90 percent in patient satisfaction.

The Four Diamond Fund for the Penn State Hershey Children's Hospital was established to conquer childhood cancer by assisting children and their families through treatment. The fund has helped more than 2,000 families by offsetting the cost of treatment and additional expenses incurred during treatment.

The Penn State Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic organize a yearly dance marathon known as THON to raise funds for the Four Diamond Fund. The first THON took place in 1973 and has raised more than \$68.9 million since then. THON now has 15,000 student volunteers and is part of a year-long effort to raise funds and

awareness. This year's THON raised over \$7.8 million just last weekend for pediatric cancer patients. THON is the largest student-run philanthropy in the world and helps to make a difference in the lives of children with pediatric cancer.

□ 1600

As a proud Penn State alumnus and Member representing them here in Washington, I want to congratulate Penn State—the dancers, the students, the individuals who make the donations, and the organizations involved in the THON event. I want to recognize them for their commitment to helping others. Their activities have truly touched the lives of so many.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, a little over a week ago, I spent a very memorable and moving afternoon watching Penn State students taking part in THON, the annual Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon. THON at Penn State is no small event. It remains the largest student-run philanthropy in the world which since 1977 has raised over \$68 million for the Four Diamonds Fund at Penn State Children's Hospital to fight childhood cancer.

THON involves over 15,000 student volunteers from Penn State's University Park campus and its 19 commonwealth campuses. Over 700 dancers take part in THON's marquee event: a 46 hour dance marathon at the Bryce Jordan Center. Thousands of other students join in as moralers, family and public relations, entertainment, donor relations, finance, communication, hospitality, logistics, technology, rules and regulations, and 'OPP'erations team members. These students' year-long efforts culminate in THON weekend—truly an amazing and uplifting sight to see.

All of the student dancers, volunteers and sponsors who participated in this year's THON deserve recognition from Congress and the thanks of Americans everywhere for their work to help end the scourge of childhood cancer. Their hard work resulted in raising \$7.83 million this year, breaking last year's record of \$7.5 million.

I am proud to say that my own daughter was among the hundreds of students who took part in THON 2010. Ali served on the Morale Committee "Jule Runnings" and helped lift the spirits of exhausted dancers, massage tired feet, and lead the hourly line-dance to keep everyone moving to stay motivated for their cause.

Penn State students are joined by hundreds of Four Diamonds Families from Penn State Children's Hospital who look forward to THON all year round. Four Diamond Families often develop lifetime friendships with the Fraternities, Sororities, and organizations that "adopt" them and spend time with them throughout the year. At THON weekend you will find the kids running throughout the event, participating in talent shows, playing games with the dancers, getting piggyback rides and even starting water-pistol fights with unsuspecting volunteers. The culmination of the weekend is Family Hour—when families share the struggle in the fight against childhood cancer with everyone in attendance. This

was a deeply emotionally moving hour that brought the struggle of childhood cancer into a personal light. Some of the stories had happy endings, some did not. But each story was an inspiration to keep fighting for the cure for childhood cancers. These children and families are why Penn State dances.

THON is a life changing event for anyone who attends or takes part in the event. And while Penn State students are hoping to change the lives of children affected by childhood cancer, more often than not it's the students whose lives are changed by participating in THON. Love truly does "Belong Here." We Are Penn State—For the Kids.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, again, I urge strong support of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1112.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 362) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of the National School Lunch Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 362

Whereas the National School Lunch Program is declared to be the policy of the United States Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of food and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs;

Whereas Federal regulations further state that participating schools shall ensure that children gain a full understanding of the relationship between proper eating and good health;

Whereas local educational agencies are responsible for collaborating with the school community to implement comprehensive nutrition and wellness policies in schools that participate in the National School Lunch Program;

Whereas all of the Nation's more than 49,000,000 pupils deserve access to high-quality, safe, nutritious meals available in the school setting, recognizing the link between adequate nourishment and educational performance;

Whereas children that experience hunger have been shown to be more likely to have

lower math scores, decreased attentiveness, increased likelihood of repeating a grade, increased absences and tardiness, and more referrals to special education services;

Whereas in 2009, the National School Lunch Program in the United States provided over 31,000,000 meals to school children daily, and must comply with rigorous State and Federal requirements, provide adequate food preparation and dining facilities, and cover costs to provide reimbursable meals including food, energy, transportation, labor, and other costs;

Whereas the National School Lunch Program must provide nutritious meals that are consistent with the goals of the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans;

Whereas the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies of Sciences recommends increased amounts of fruits, vegetables, and whole grains in the National School Lunch Program, and that measures to improve the quality of meals may increase program costs and the need for administrative support;

Whereas school food service must operate on a nonprofit basis, and it is expected that the Federal subsidy for a free meal will, on average, cover the costs of producing a reimbursable meal;

Whereas the U.S. Department of Agriculture identified that the full cost to produce a reimbursable lunch generally exceeds the Federal reimbursement for a free lunch; and

Whereas revenue deficits in school meal programs must be offset by generating additional revenue from other sources that may otherwise support classroom instruction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the National School Lunch Program; and

(2) recognizes that America's pupils deserve access to high-quality, safe, nutritious meals available in the school setting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 362 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 362, which expresses the House of Representatives' support of the goals and ideals of the National School Lunch Program.

When it comes to education in our country, we traditionally focus on reading, writing, and extracurricular activities. We want to ensure that our students have access to well-trained teachers and to the tools they need to achieve academic success. However, we often forget that an essential tool to any child's academic success can also be found outside the classroom—in the school cafeteria.

Children who are hungry are at a disadvantage to their peers. Studies have shown that children who experience hunger throughout the day have higher likelihoods of receiving lower math scores, of having decreased attentiveness, increased absences and tardiness, and a higher chance of having to repeat a grade. Children who are not well nourished are also more likely to need referrals to special education services.

We know that nearly one-third of our Nation's children today are overweight and obese. Obesity rates have soared over the past four decades among children of all age groups, increasing nearly five-fold among those who are ages 6 through 11. Teaching children to have a healthy relationship with food and nutrition has never been more important.

First Lady Michelle Obama has initiated an exciting new program to help solve this challenge. The "Let's Move!" campaign directs attention to four areas: helping parents make healthy family choices; serving healthier food in schools; improving access to healthy, affordable food in communities; and increasing physical activity.

The National School Lunch Program can have a central role in the First Lady's efforts to help children develop healthy behaviors and to achieve their highest potential. For over 60 years, the National School Lunch Program has served as a safeguard for the health and nutritional well-being of our Nation's children. Every day, over 31 million meals are served to schoolchildren across the country.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to take note of the changes we have seen in school food menus over the years. In cafeterias in all of our communities, you might find menus which offer salad bars with fresh fruit, whole wheat pizza, or freshly made chicken wraps. The days of "mystery meat" are past. Today, students want to eat in the school cafeteria because the food tastes good and there are many food options.

However, we know from the most recent report from the Institute of Medicine that healthy foods cost more. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has reported that the full cost to produce a reimbursable lunch generally exceeds that of the Federal reimbursement for free lunches. To help address this concern, the President has requested an additional \$1 billion for child nutrition programs to help improve nutrition quality and to make these programs accessible to more children. These funds will go a long way in school cafeterias across the country.

I look forward to working with the President and with my colleagues, particularly with those on the House Education and Labor Committee, on this initiative.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, this week, each of us may be receiving visits from our local school food service directors. I want to acknowledge the fine work of the school food service workers who help to educate our children on nutri-

tion and who work hard every day to serve them safe and healthy meals. They are the front line in these efforts, and they deserve our thanks.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Representative WATSON of California for introducing this important resolution, which highlights the need for this program, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 362, expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of the National School Lunch Program.

The National School Lunch Program was first established by the National School Lunch Act in 1946. The program enables students to purchase school lunches at a free or reduced price, focusing on students whose families cannot afford the full price of school meals. The program also promotes a basic understanding of nutrition and healthful eating.

In fiscal year 2009, over 31.2 million children participated in the School Lunch Program every day; 19.4 million of those children received their meals for free or at a reduced rate. Participation has steadily grown over the years since the program was first established over 60 years ago. The School Lunch Program is administered in approximately 101,000 schools and institutions by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service. At the State level, it is administered by State education agencies through agreements with local school food authorities.

Public or nonprofit private schools, serving grades K through 12, and public or nonprofit private residential child care institutions may participate in the School Lunch Program. School districts and independent schools that participate in the Lunch Program receive cash subsidies from the U.S. Department of Agriculture for each meal or snack they serve and USDA foods or commodities. In return, they must serve lunches and snacks that meet Federal requirements, and they must offer free or reduced-price lunches to eligible children.

The National School Lunch Program helps to provide meals during the school day to students who may not otherwise be able to afford them. I stand in support of this resolution expressing support for the goals and the ideals of the National School Lunch Program and for the children that it serves. I ask for my colleagues' support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, I urge strong support for the resolution. It is a timely measure because, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, today the Education and Labor Committee is holding

a hearing on reauthorizing the Child Nutrition Act. The School Lunch Program is really at the center of that effort. Again, I urge support of the resolution.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the National School Lunch Program, as established by the National School Lunch Act, has been serving our nation's children for more than 60 years. This program safeguards the health and well-being of children by providing balanced meals for free or at low cost. Just last year, the Program provided more than 31 million nutritious meals to children across the nation. My bill, House Resolution 362 recognizes the outstanding service of the National School Lunch Program.

Hunger is on the rise in the United States. A 2007 USDA report found that 12.4 million children live in households that are considered to be food insecure. In my state, California, the unemployment rate exceeds 12% and is on the rise. More families will be struggling to put nutritious meals on the table. The National School Lunch Program performs an exemplary service in providing for the children of these families. With H. Res. 362, Congress can send a strong message to schools showing our continued support and give local programs the initiative to improve and advance.

By providing school lunches, Congress plays a vital role in ensuring that our nation's children are healthy, which is more important now than ever. Both obesity and malnutrition are on the rise, increasing the rates of Type 2 diabetes and heart problems among children. The current generation of children and their parents are accustomed to processed, fast food; a fast stop for a hamburger and fries or a quick fix meal from a box. Though these meals may be cheap and easy, they often lack the proper nutrition a developing child requires.

Over the past few years, schools have made a conscious effort to ensure that children receive balanced and nutritious meals. For many children, their school lunch may be the most nutritious meal they will eat each day. Simply by including fresh fruits and vegetables in their diets daily encourages children to make healthy choices. The Program is a tool that can help educate children about eating well even when they are at home.

Providing meals in school also increases a child's ability to learn effectively. Children who experience hunger in school have been shown to have lower math scores, decreased attentiveness, increased likelihood of repeating a grade, increased absences and tardiness, and more referrals to special education services. Simply by providing nutritious meals, Congress can improve student performance in school.

Supporting the National School Lunch Program brings to life its mission "to safeguard the health and well being of our nation's children." This is one crucial way in which we can protect the health of children nationwide. I hope you will all join me in supporting the National School Lunch Program, H. Res. 362.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 362, a resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of the National School Lunch Program. The National School Lunch Program is a federally assisted meal program operating in public and nonprofit private schools and residential child care insti-

tutions. It provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost or free lunches to children each school day. I support this resolution because it recognizes the fundamental role the National School Lunch Program plays in making sure that every child, regardless of socioeconomic status, has the energy and nutrients he or she needs to learn and grow as scholars.

The National School Lunch Program has been providing for children in our public schools for over sixty years. It was established under the National School Lunch Act signed by President Harry Truman in 1946. In 2008, the National School Lunch Program provided meals for more than 30 million American children. Parents who work two and three jobs just to put a roof over their children's heads do not have to worry that their children will not have lunch when they get to school every day. In 1998, Congress expanded this program to include reimbursement for snacks that children receive at afterschool programs. Children receive nutritious snacks so they have the energy and ability to focus during valuable tutoring sessions and enriching extra-curricular lessons.

Mr. Speaker, during these difficult economic times, the National School Lunch Program is even more important than usual. In September 2009, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities released an analysis of how the recession had affected working families thus far. According to that report, the median household income declined 3.6 percent in 2008 after adjusting for inflation, the largest single-year decline on record. The poverty rate rose to 13.2 percent, its highest level since 1997. The number of people in poverty hit 39.8 million, the highest level since 1960. While Congress works to turn this recession around by passing landmark legislation like the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and the Jobs for Main Street Act, programs such as the National School Lunch Program give working parents the peace of mind that comes with knowing that their children are taken care of. If a parent loses his job and his family falls into poverty, he does not have to worry that his children will have nutritious lunches and snacks provided every day at school. That is one less thing for hard-working families to worry about in these tough times.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the National School Lunch Program for its dedication feeding our most valuable population in this country—our children. Without nutritious food, low-income children would have extreme difficulties focusing in school and therefore would be at a great disadvantage academically. The National School Lunch Program does its part to ensure that all children have the energy they need to learn and succeed every day in school. I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 362.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the actions of the House of Representatives in addressing the need for America's students to receive high-quality, safe, nutritious meals in school. I strongly support H. Res. 362 and urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Many of our children depend on the National School Lunch Program for nutritious meals. In Fiscal Year 2007, more than 30.5 million children each day got their lunch through the National School Lunch Program. In my home state of Georgia, about 74 percent of public school students eat school

lunch. In some counties, in the Fourth District of Georgia, up to 90 percent of students participate in the school lunch program. For many of the children in my District, school lunch fuels their day.

I applaud Representative WATSON for introducing this resolution. It recognizes the link between proper eating, good health, and educational performance. We should do all we can to ensure that our children continue to have nutritious meal options available through the National School Lunch Program.

I join the chairman in urging my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 362, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

READ ACROSS AMERICA DAY

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1111) designating March 2, 2010, as "Read Across America Day".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1111

Whereas reading is a basic requirement for quality education and professional success, and is a source of pleasure throughout life;

Whereas the people of the United States must be able to read if the United States is to remain competitive in the global economy;

Whereas Congress has placed great emphasis on reading intervention that has been proven effective through scientifically valid research and providing additional resources for reading assistance; and

Whereas more than 50 national organizations concerned about reading and education have joined with the National Education Association to use March 2 to celebrate reading and the birth of Theodor Geisel, also known as Dr. Seuss: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Theodor Geisel, also known as Dr. Seuss, for his success in encouraging children to discover the joy of reading;

(2) honors the 13th anniversary of Read Across America Day;

(3) encourages parents to read with their children for at least 30 minutes on Read Across America Day in honor of the commitment of the House of Representatives to building a Nation of readers; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1111 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1111, which recognizes March 2, 2010, as Read Across America Day and which encourages parents to read to their children in support of building a Nation of readers.

Read Across America Day was initiated in May 1998 by the National Education Association as a way to celebrate reading. The NEA provides support to parents and teachers to keep their children reading all year long through activities such as the Cat-A-Van. The Cat-A-Van travels across the country bringing the gift of reading to schoolchildren. The Cat-A-Van donates 20,000 books to children in need.

The NEA celebrates Read Across America Day on Dr. Seuss' birthday each year in honor of a man who contributed tremendously to children's literacy. Theodor Geisel, better known as "Dr. Seuss" by millions of children and parents around the world, began writing children's books in 1936, and has since inspired millions of children to embrace the joys of readings through such favorites as "The Cat in the Hat," "Green Eggs and Ham," and "Oh, the Places You'll Go."

We know from research that children who are exposed to reading before kindergarten become more successful readers. We also know that a child who fails at reading is more likely to drop out of school. Today, nearly 6 million adolescents are struggling readers, and more than 7,000 students drop out of high school every day. This is unacceptable. Engaging children and reading to them when they are young will encourage them to read and to achieve more as adolescents and as adults.

This data demonstrates the importance of literacy and the value of Read Across America. This critical literacy project is supported by a range of partners, including the District of Columbia's the Afterschool Alliance, ASPIRA Association, Incorporated, and First Book. The NEA, along with the Pearson Foundation, has donated \$100,000 in funds and books to public school libraries across our country as 45 million

children and adults are expected to participate in this year's 2010 program.

I want to particularly thank Representatives MARKEY and EHLERS for bringing this measure forward, and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1111, designating March 2, 2010, as "Read Across America Day."

Once upon a time, when there were no televisions or computers, reading was a primary leisure activity. People would spend hours reading books and using their imaginations to travel to lands far away. Today, many people do not have the same passion to read. This is unfortunate because reading offers a productive approach to improving vocabulary and word power.

Indulging in reading on a daily basis helps keep adults and children abreast of the various styles of writing and new vocabulary. Children who start reading from an early age are observed to have good language skills and to grasp the variances in phonics much better. Research has shown that children and teenagers who love reading have comparatively higher IQs and that they are more creative and excel in school and college.

Reading is an activity that involves greater levels of concentration, and it adds to the conversational skills of the reader. It is an indulgence that enhances the knowledge acquired consistently. The habit of reading also helps readers to decipher new words and phrases that they come across in everyday conversations. It helps us to stay in touch with contemporary writers as well as those from yesteryear.

Theodor Geisel, more famously known as "Dr. Seuss," is the most beloved children's book author of all time. His titles include "Green Eggs and Ham," "Fox in Socks," and "The Cat in the Hat." His use of rhymes makes his books an effective tool for teaching young children the basic tools they need to be successful and to develop a lifelong love of reading. Celebrating both Dr. Seuss and reading sends a clear message to our children that reading is both fun and important.

I thank my colleague from Colorado (Ms. MARKEY) and my colleague from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for sponsoring this resolution, and I ask that all of my colleagues support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentlewoman from Colorado, Congresswoman BETSY MARKEY.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a cat who is known worldwide for his red and white hat; in support of a fox who liked to wear socks, and his game-playing friend called Mr. Knox; in support

of an elephant, Horton, who hears a Who, and a human, Mr. Brown, who proves he can moo; in support of those who hopped on pop, and the dad who yelled at them to stop; in support of those amusing sidekicks Thing One and Thing Two, and all of those folks with the last name of Who; in support of Marvin K. Mooney, who just wouldn't go, and those multiple colored fish we all know; in support of Cindy Lou Who and that mean, old Grinch, and the Lorax who speaks for the trees in a pinch.

These characters taught our children to read. In the field of children's literacy, Dr. Seuss took the lead.

Through the power of green eggs and ham, our children exclaim, "I can read, Sam I am."

Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today not to emulate Dr. Seuss but to honor his legacy with Read Across America Day. Today, March 2, would be Theodor Seuss Geisel's 106th birthday. This resolution honors his birth, and it promotes children's literacy by designating today as Read Across America Day.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman EHLERS, for his work with me on this resolution.

In schools across America today, millions of children will participate in Seussational reading events.

□ 1615

Reading skills are the keystone for future educational success, and it is critical that our children begin reading at a young age. I remember how my own children's eyes would light up with each book we read. My resolution encourages parents to read to their children for at least 30 minutes a day because, as Dr. Seuss himself said, "The more that you read, the more things you will know; the more that you learn, the more places you will go."

I have high hopes for this Nation's children and all the places that they will go. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on House Resolution 1111 and to celebrate Read Across America Day.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1111.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4247, PREVENTING HARMFUL RESTRAINT AND SECLUSION IN SCHOOLS ACT

Mr. CARDOZA, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-425) on the resolution (H. Res. 1126) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4247) to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint and seclusion in schools, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Resolution 1072, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3820, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1097, de novo.

Remaining postponed questions will be taken later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

RECOGNIZING LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1072, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1072, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—383

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocchieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLaunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.

Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Graves
Green, Al
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas

Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter

Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Richardson
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—48

Austria
Barrett (SC)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cassidy
Clarke
Cohen
Costello
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)

Engel
Fallin
Garamendi
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Marchant

McCaul
McMahon
Mollohan
Putnam
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rush
Schwartz
Smith (TX)
Stark
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1859

Messrs. CONAWAY and FRANK of Massachusetts changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATURAL HAZARDS RISK REDUCTION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3820, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3820, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 335, nays 50, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—335

Ackerman	Ehlers	Mack
Aderholt	Ellison	Maffei
Adler (NJ)	Ellsworth	Maloney
Akin	Emerson	Markey (CO)
Alexander	Engel	Markey (MA)
Altmire	Eshoo	Marshall
Andrews	Etheridge	Massa
Arcuri	Farr	Matheson
Baca	Fattah	Matsui
Bachmann	Filner	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Fleming	McCarthy (NY)
Baird	Forbes	McClintock
Baldwin	Fortenberry	McCollum
Barrow	Foster	McCotter
Bartlett	Frank (MA)	McDermott
Bean	Frelinghuysen	McGovern
Becerra	Fudge	McHenry
Berkley	Gallely	McIntyre
Berman	Gerlach	McKeon
Berry	Giffords	McMorris
Biggart	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Bilbray	Gonzalez	McNerney
Bilirakis	Graves	Meek (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Meeks (NY)
Bishop (NY)	Griffith	Melancon
Blackburn	Guthrie	Michaud
Blumenauer	Hall (NY)	Miller (NC)
Blunt	Halvorson	Miller, Gary
Boccieri	Hare	Miller, George
Boehner	Harman	Minnick
Bonner	Harper	Mitchell
Bono Mack	Hastings (FL)	Moore (KS)
Boozman	Heinrich	Moore (WI)
Boren	Heller	Moran (KS)
Boswell	Herger	Moran (VA)
Boucher	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy (CT)
Boustany	Higgins	Murphy (NY)
Boyd	Hill	Murphy, Patrick
Brady (PA)	Himes	Murphy, Tim
Braley (IA)	Hinchey	Myrick
Bright	Hirono	Nadler (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Hodes	Napolitano
Ginny	Holden	Neal (MA)
Buchanan	Holt	Nye
Calvert	Honda	Oberstar
Cantor	Hoyer	Obey
Cao	Hunter	Olson
Capito	Inslee	Olver
Capps	Israel	Ortiz
Capuano	Issa	Pallone
Cardoza	Jenkins	Pascarell
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Paulsen
Carson (IN)	Kagen	Payne
Carter	Kanjorski	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Perriello
Chandler	Kennedy	Peters
Childers	Kildee	Peterson
Chu	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pingree (ME)
Clarke	Kilroy	Pitts
Clay	King	Polis (CO)
Cleaver	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kirk	Posey
Cole	Kissell	Price (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Klein (FL)	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kline (MN)	Quigley
Cooper	Kosmas	Radanovich
Costa	Kratovil	Rahall
Courtney	Kucinich	Rangel
Crowley	Lance	Reichert
Cuellar	Langevin	Richardson
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Roe (TN)
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Davis (IL)	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Davis (KY)	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Davis (TN)	Lee (CA)	Rohrabacher
DeFazio	Lee (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Levin	Roskam
Delahunt	Lewis (CA)	Ross
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Rothman (NJ)
Dent	Linder	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lipinski	Royce
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger
Dicks	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Salazar
Doggett	Lowey	Sánchez, Linda
Donnelly (IN)	Lucas	T.
Doyle	Luetkemeyer	Sanchez, Loretta
Dreier	Luján	Sarbanes
Driehaus	Lungren, Daniel	Scalise
Edwards (MD)	E.	Schakowsky
Edwards (TX)	Lynch	Schauer

Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder

Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 382, noes 0, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

AYES—382

Ackerman	Cuellar	Jenkins
Aderholt	Culberson	Johnson (GA)
Adler (NJ)	Cummings	Johnson (IL)
Akin	Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.
Alexander	Davis (IL)	Jones
Altmire	Davis (KY)	Jordan (OH)
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Kagen
Arcuri	DeFazio	Kanjorski
Baca	DeGette	Kaptur
Bachmann	Delahunt	Kennedy
Bachus	DeLauro	Kildee
Baird	Dent	Kilpatrick (MI)
Baldwin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilroy
Barrow	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind
Bartlett	Dicks	King (IA)
Barton (TX)	Dingell	King (NY)
Bean	Doggett	Kingston
Becerra	Donnelly (IN)	Kirk
Berkley	Doyle	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Berman	Dreier	Kissell
Berry	Driehaus	Klein (FL)
Biggart	Duncan	Kline (MN)
Bilbray	Edwards (MD)	Kosmas
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Kratovil
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Kucinich
Bishop (NY)	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Engel	Lance
Blackburn	Eshoo	Langevin
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Blunt	Farr	Larson (CT)
Boccieri	Fattah	Latham
Boehner	Filner	LaTourette
Bonner	Flake	Latta
Bono Mack	Fleming	Lee (CA)
Boozman	Forbes	Lee (NY)
Boren	Fortenberry	Levin
Boswell	Foster	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Foxo	Lewis (GA)
Boustany	Frank (MA)	Linder
Boyd	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Braley (IA)	Fudge	Loeb sack
Bright	Gallely	Lofgren, Zoe
Brown (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lowey
Brown-Waite,	Gerlach	Lucas
Ginny	Giffords	Luetkemeyer
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Luján
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	Lummis
Calvert	Gonzalez	Lungren, Daniel
Cantor	Goodlatte	E.
Cao	Graves	Lynch
Capito	Green, Al	Mack
Capps	Griffith	Maffei
Capuano	Guthrie	Maloney
Cardoza	Hall (NY)	Manzullo
Carnahan	Halvorson	Markey (CO)
Carney	Hare	Markey (MA)
Carson (IN)	Harman	Marshall
Carter	Harper	Massa
Castle	Hastings (FL)	Matheson
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Chaffetz	Heinrich	McCarthy (CA)
Chandler	Heller	McCarthy (NY)
Childers	Hensarling	McClintock
Chu	Herger	McCollum
Clarke	Herseth Sandlin	McCotter
Clay	Higgins	McDermott
Cleaver	Hill	McGovern
Clyburn	Himes	McHenry
Coble	Hinchey	McIntyre
Coffman (CO)	Hirono	McKeon
Cole	Hodes	McMorris
Conaway	Holden	Rodgers
Connolly (VA)	Holt	McNerney
Conyers	Honda	Meek (FL)
Cooper	Hoyer	Meeks (NY)
Costa	Hunter	Melancon
Courtney	Inslee	Melancon
Crenshaw	Israel	Michaud
Crowley	Issa	Miller (FL)

NAYS—50

Barton (TX)
Bishop (UT)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Duncan
Flake
Lummis
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert

Neugebauer
Nunes
Owens
Paul
Pence
Petri
Platts
Poe (TX)
Rooney
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Shimkus
Souder
Stearns
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—46

Austria
Barrett (SC)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cassidy
Cohen
Costello
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)

McCaul
McMahon
Mollohan
Putnam
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rush
Schwartz
Smith (TX)
Stark
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1908

Mr. WESTMORELAND changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ENGINEERS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1097.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1097.

The question was taken.

Miller (MI)	Radanovich	Smith (NJ)
Miller (NC)	Rahall	Smith (WA)
Miller, Gary	Rangel	Snyder
Miller, George	Reichert	Souder
Minnick	Richardson	Space
Mitchell	Roe (TN)	Speier
Moore (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Spratt
Moore (WI)	Rogers (KY)	Stearns
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Stupak
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Sutton
Murphy (CT)	Rooney	Teague
Murphy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Murphy, Patrick	Roskam	Thompson (CA)
Murphy, Tim	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Myrick	Rothman (NJ)	Thompson (PA)
Nadler (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Napolitano	Royce	Tiahrt
Neal (MA)	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Titus
Nye	Salazar	Tonko
Oberstar	Sánchez, Linda	Towns
Obey	T.	Tsongas
Olson	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner
Olver	Sarbanes	Upton
Ortiz	Scalise	Van Hollen
Owens	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Pallone	Schauer	Visclosky
Pascarella	Schiff	Walden
Pastor (AZ)	Schmidt	Walz
Paul	Schock	Wasserman
Paulsen	Schrader	Schultz
Payne	Scott (GA)	Waters
Pence	Scott (VA)	Watson
Perlmutter	Sensenbrenner	Watt
Perriello	Serrano	Waxman
Peters	Sessions	Weiner
Peterson	Sestak	Welch
Petri	Shadegg	Westmoreland
Pingree (ME)	Shea-Porter	Whitfield
Pitts	Sherman	Wilson (OH)
Platts	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Poe (TX)	Shuler	Wittman
Polis (CO)	Shuster	Wolf
Pomeroy	Simpson	Woolsey
Posey	Sires	Wu
Price (GA)	Skelton	Yarmuth
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Quigley	Smith (NE)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—49

Austria	Emerson	Marchant
Barrett (SC)	Fallin	McCaul
Brady (TX)	Garamendi	McMahon
Brown (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Mollohan
Brown, Corrine	Granger	Putnam
Burgess	Grayson	Rehberg
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Reyes
Buyer	Grijalva	Rodriguez
Camp	Gutierrez	Rush
Campbell	Hall (TX)	Schwartz
Cassidy	Hinojosa	Smith (TX)
Cohen	Hoekstra	Stark
Costello	Inglis	Sullivan
Dahlkemper	Jackson (IL)	Tanner
Davis (AL)	Jackson Lee	Taylor
Deal (GA)	(TX)	Wamp
Edwards (TX)	Johnson, Sam	

□ 1917

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 75, 76 and 77.

RESOLUTION TO DEBATE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. This Thursday, I will bring to the House a resolution which will finally give this House a chance to debate the war in Afghanistan.

We now have about 1,000 U.S. troops who have perished in the conflict. We have many innocent civilians who have lost their lives. We have a corrupt central government in Afghanistan that is basically stealing U.S. tax dollars.

The Washington Post had a story last week of how up to \$200 million is passing through airports from Kabul to Dubai, and it is suspected the money is either U.S. aid, money from drug traffic, or both. What a mess this is.

We are finally going to have a vote on the privileged resolution. It will be dropped on Thursday; it will lay over for the weekend. On Tuesday there will be a rule. On Wednesday we will have 3 hours of debate.

Let's get ready to debate Afghanistan, and let's get ready for Congress to get in the game and take Americans out.

RECOGNIZING DR. BRUCE LOCKLEAR, PRINCIPAL OF EDINA HIGH SCHOOL

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edina High School Principal Dr. Bruce Locklear, who was recently named the 2010 Minnesota High School Principal of the Year by the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals.

Members of the association chose Bruce for his collaborative leadership style and his effort to create a more personal school environment, and those traits have certainly paid off. Under the leadership of Principal Locklear, Edina High School has gained praise and recognition, both in Minnesota and throughout the Nation. Edina was ranked among the top 2 percent of high schools in the Nation last year by U.S. News & World Report, and ranked 91st overall in the latest poll by Newsweek. Additionally, Edina has introduced several innovative education programs and a new student leadership program during his tenure.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Dr. Locklear on this well-deserved achievement.

RECOGNIZING RODNEY NAPIER FOR HIS EFFORTS TO HELP THE PEOPLE OF HAITI

(Mr. BOCCIERI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOCCIERI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in recognition of a fine businessman from Stark County, Ohio. His

name is Rodney Napier. His service to the relief effort and helping those in Haiti who need long-term medical care as a result of the earthquake is a show of selfless and truly inspirational giving to the world.

Mr. Napier helped found the Granted Wish Foundation, a national non-profit whose mission is "to provide wishful fulfillment to disabled, disadvantaged and deserving individuals and families."

When the earthquake shocked Haiti and the world, Mr. Napier made his corporate jet available so that supplies, doctors, missionaries, and other relief workers could get to the island for help. Humbled by what he saw while volunteering himself, he realized he had to do more. He donated nearly \$70,000 to the relief effort. He also auctioned off three Super Bowl tickets, totaling \$12,000, and the Granted Wish Foundation collected more than \$63,000 for Haitians in need. Using these donations, two medical treatment vehicles went to Haiti so that physicians could rehabilitate permanently disabled children.

Mr. Napier proves that simple acts of charity can make the difference and save lives. He lives by the biblical lesson that "to whom much is given, much is expected." Whether in our local community or in Haiti, we need leaders like him.

TRY DETAINEES IN CUBA

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, my office introduced legislation to have all the detainees at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba tried in a military commission at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Recently, when I was at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, I visited the men and women who are serving in uniform guarding the prisoners at that facility in a facility that has cost taxpayers in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. We also have a state-of-the-art courtroom there to accommodate. I urge Members to support this bill, which is a commonsense resolution to a very controversial issue this year. Try the detainees in Cuba in a military court martial.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this is a unique day in

the history of the great State of Texas. Today, March 2, marks Texas Independence Day; and on this day 174 years ago, Texas declared its independence from Mexico and its dictator, Santa Anna.

In 1836, in the small farm village of Washington-on-the-Brazos, 54 Texians—as they called themselves—gathered to do something bold and courageous: they signed the Texas Declaration of Independence from Mexico and once and for all declared that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign and independent republic.

As these determined delegates met to declare independence, Santa Anna and his 6,000 enemy troops were marching on an old beat-up Spanish fort, a mission that we call the Alamo. There, Texas defenders stood defiant and stood determined. They were led by a 27-year-old lawyer by the name of William Barrett Travis. The Alamo and its 187 Texians were all that stood between the invaders and the Republic of Texas. And behind the cold, dark, damp walls of that Alamo, Commander William Barrett Travis sent the following letter to Texas requesting aid. Here is what this appeal said in part:

“To all the people of Texas and Americans throughout the world, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the enemy under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannon fire for over 24 hours, but I have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded surrender at its discretion, otherwise the fort will be put to the sword. I have answered that demand with a cannon shot, and the flag still waves proudly over the wall.

“I shall never surrender or retreat. I call upon you in the name of liberty and patriotism and everything dear to our character to come to our aid with all dispatch. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself for as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due his honor and that of his country. Victory or death.”—William Barrett Travis, Colonel, Texas Army.

After 13 days of glory at the Alamo, Commander Travis and his men sacrificed their lives on the altar of freedom. However, those lives would not be lost in vain. Their determination did pay off, and because heroes like Travis, Davy Crockett and Jim Bowie held out so long, Santa Anna's forces took such great losses they became battered and demoralized. As Travis said, “Victory will cost them more dearly than defeat.”

The Alamo defenders were from every State and 13 foreign countries. They were black, brown, and white. Their ages were 16 through 67, and they were all volunteers. They were mavericks, revolutionaries, farmers, shopkeepers, and freedom fighters; and they came together to fight for something they believed in: freedom and independence.

□ 1930

General Sam Houston, in turn, had the time he needed to devise a strategy

to rally other Texas volunteers to ultimately defeat Santa Anna in the Battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836.

The war was over, and the Lone Star flag was visible all across the broad, bold, brazen plains of Texas.

Texas remained a nation for 9 years and claimed land that now includes part of New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, Wyoming, even up to the Canadian border.

In 1845, Texas was admitted to the Union by only one vote when a Louisiana Senator changed his mind. By treaty with the United States, Texas may divide into five States, and the Texas flag is to fly even with the U.S. flag and not below it.

So, today, we remember that Texas was a glorious nation once and won freedom and independence because some fierce volunteers fought to the death for liberty over tyranny.

One of my grandsons is named Barrett Houston in honor of Travis and General Sam.

In Colonel Travis' final letter from the Alamo, he signed off with 3 words: God and Texas, God and Texas, God and Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE of Texas. I will yield.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. As a sixth-generation native Texan, I want to commend you for honoring Texas Independence Day, March 2, the 174th birthday of the Republic of Texas. I commend you for the fine work that you do, not just for your constituency in the Houston area, but for the entire State and America.

God bless you, Congressman POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. In reclaiming my time, thank you.

And that's just the way it is, Mr. Speaker.

NO WINNERS IN THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater security threat in the world than the continued development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. A single nuclear strike has the power to destroy the planet and to obliterate the human race.

The headline in Sunday's New York Times read, “White House is rethinking nuclear policy.” Boy, did it need some rethinking.

After years of a grossly irresponsible nuclear strategy, we should all be grateful that the Obama administration seems poised on this issue to put us on a course toward peace and global security.

It appears that the President is prepared to dramatically reduce the size of the U.S. nuclear stockpile. All accounts are that there will be no development of new nuclear weapons on his watch. That includes the unnecessarily

dangerous, expensive, and wasteful “bunker buster”—the pet nuke of the previous administration. While his predecessor thumbed his nose at the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, President Obama is sincere about honoring our multilateral obligations.

Not all the news is that encouraging, however. The emerging White House strategy looks like it will include an increased reliance on missile defense systems, which have proven themselves to be a failure and a waste of taxpayer money for going on 30 years now. Most ominously, there appears to be some reluctance in the White House to adopt a “no first use” policy. In other words, we would not specifically rule out the possibility of a preemptive nuclear strike. This should terrify all of us, Mr. Speaker, because it takes only a single nuclear attack to unleash untold human suffering, the likes of which the world has never seen.

What possible national security objective could be served by using weapons that could wipe out civilization?

I encourage the White House to be bold in its pursuit of a world free of nuclear weapons. Specifically, I want to see the administration adopt the principles of the “NO NUKES” resolution that I have introduced in this Congress—“NO NUKES,” which stands for Nonproliferation Options for Nuclear Understanding to Keep Everyone Safe.

The resolution specifically declares that the United States would not use nuclear weapons first, regarding them as a deterrent against attack until their eventual complete elimination.

The resolution also calls for more aggressive multilateral negotiations toward disarmament, greater cooperation with Russia toward dismantling Cold War nuclear warheads, a reaffirmation of the moratorium on nuclear testing, and a ban on weapons in outer space.

Nuclear nonproliferation is one of the pillars of the Smart Security approach that I have been advocating from this Chamber for years, Mr. Speaker. “Smart Security” means using more brains and less brawn to keep America safe. It treats war only as a last resort. It demands that we stop equating security with aggression or belligerence. It advances our security goals through humanitarian rather than military means—more development aid, more diplomacy, more conflict resolution, and a more vigorous commitment to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons.

There can be no winners in the nuclear arms race. We cannot afford to get this one wrong. I hope our President treats this issue with the urgency and the sensitivity that it deserves. Nothing less than the life of every man, woman, and child on Earth is at stake.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank 370 Members of the House of Representatives for joining me in an effort to rename the Department of Navy to be the Navy and Marine Corps.

I would also like to share with the House that last Thursday was a very exciting day for this effort, the reason being that Mike Blum, a Marine Corps League executive director, was the MC at a news conference that was attended.

One of the speakers was United States Marine General Tony Zinni.

Senator PAT ROBERTS, from the Senate, introduced an identical bill to the bill H.R. 24, which 370 Members cosponsored.

Also in attendance to speak was General Al Gray, a former commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

There was a very impressive young man from Texas, Sergeant Eddie Wright, a marine veteran and Bronze Star recipient, who lost both hands in combat in Iraq in 2004. Despite his injuries, he became a Marine Corps hand-to-hand combat instructor. He later retired and is now a defense contractor. Sergeant Wright explained the importance of teamwork between the Navy and Marine Corps because he said at the news conference, if he had not had the Navy corpsman there, he would not have been living today to appear at the news conference, calling for this relationship to be publicly respected—the Navy and Marine Corps.

There also was a father, Dick Linn, whose son, Karl, was killed in Iraq in 2005.

Tracy Della Vecchia, the MarineParents.com founder and executive director, was there. Her Web site has over 130,000-plus members. It provides support for parents of marines. She also spoke on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this news conference was to announce the national spokesman. The national spokesman was also in attendance, and he spoke as well—Lee Ermey, known as the “Gunny,” a Golden Globe-nominated actor and marine veteran. Ermey is host of the History Channel’s “Mail Call” and “Lock N’ Load with R. Lee Ermey.” He is a star of major films, including “Full Metal Jacket,” “Dead Man Walking,” and “Toy Story.” Lee Ermey has become the national spokesman, and he intends to help us try to convince the Senate to accept three words: “and Marine Corps.”

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD letters from IKE SKELTON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and also from Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED
SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 26, 2010.

Hon. WALTER JONES,
House of Representatives, 2333 Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington DC.

DEAR WALTER: I wanted to take this opportunity to commend you on your continuing campaign to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the “Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.” Since 2001, you have worked tirelessly to bring about this change, and I am proud that, as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I have included it in the Chairman’s mark of the National Defense Authorization Acts of Fiscal Years 2008, 2009 and 2010. I regret, however, that the Senate has not been as receptive to your effort, and so far, we have been unable to carry this provision into a Conference Report, and then into law.

Walter, your dedication to this matter has been steadfast, and I commend your sincere desire to recognize the men and women of the United States Marine Corps in this way. Hopefully, 2010 will be different. With over 360 co-sponsors of your bill H.R. 24, this effort has real momentum behind it, and I will be pleased to support its consideration on the House Floor and, of course, again carry it as part of the Chairman’s mark of the national defense authorization bill for Fiscal Year 2011.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED
SERVICES,
Washington, DC, February 3, 2010.

Hon. WALTER B. JONES,
2333 Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: It is with great pleasure that I join you and Chairman Ike Skelton in the effort to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. For the past eight years, I have worked with you to see this become a reality. Now is the time to move forward. Through blood and sacrifice, the United States Marine Corps deserves such recognition and I hope that this year it becomes a reality.

As you are aware, the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) has carried this language since 2001. However, the Senate has yet to agree to our position in order for this change to take effect. Today, more than 360 members of the House have agreed with us that this change is necessary to reflect the true role of the Marine Corps within the Department of Defense, as a coequal with the Navy. I look forward to pushing this effort with you when it reaches the House Floor in the spring as a stand-alone measure and will continue to support the language in the FY11 NDAA.

Thank you for your steadfast dedication to this effort.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. “BUCK” MCKEON,
Ranking Member.

In the letters from the chairman and ranking member, they state that they will bring this bill to the floor sometime in April as a suspension bill, will pass it on the floor, and will send it to the Senate. Then it will be up to the Senate to do what they will. Hopefully, they will understand what Senator ROBERTS said. All we are asking for are three words: “and Marine Corps.”

Mr. Speaker, before I close, Dick Linn, who lost his son in Iraq in 2005, received condolence letters. He brought

this up. I happen to have these three posters of fallen heroes from Camp Lejeune. They are marines who have died. Mr. Linn said that he was so disappointed and that, when he received these condolence letters, he was so proud of his son, who was a marine. I’ll show you what he received.

Mr. Speaker, you can see on this letter—it’s a blowup—the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C., Navy flag. Nothing. There is absolutely nothing about the Marine Corps. Yet, the young man who died and many others who have died who were also marines received the same kind of letter, and there was nothing about the Marine Corps except in the body of the letter.

If this should become law—and I hope that the Senate will see the need for this, the need to recognize the Marine Corps and to say, Thank you, Marine Corps. You are one part of the fighting team, the Navy and Marine Corps. This is what it would have said:

The Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., with the Navy flag and the Marine flag. That’s what it should be. I want to say before I close, Mr. Speaker, that the Navy and Marine Corps are one fighting team. They should be represented in name as one fighting team, Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close, but as I always do close with my heart aching for all who have given their lives for this country in Afghanistan and in Iraq, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and for God to please bless their families.

God, please, in your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I ask God to please bless this House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God.

I ask God to please bless the President. Give him wisdom and strength to do what is right for this country.

Three times, I will ask God: God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

SHAMELESS EXPLOITATIONS OF
THE FILIBUSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, I am saddened as I rise in support and on behalf of the American people who do not believe that the fate of the Nation should be subject to the whims of just one single individual Senator.

The Senate filibuster was first used in 1837, and for more than a century, it has been used very sparingly and as a last resort. Even as recently as the 1960s, when the filibuster was used to obstruct historic civil rights legislation, it was used to block legislation in less than 10 percent of major bills, but a rule change in the 1970s opened up

the floodgates for abuse. Suddenly, by simply threatening to filibuster, a single Senator could obstruct any bill that lacked 60 votes. Today, the filibuster is the last stand of special interests and is a platform for grandstanding by obstructionist Senators.

In 2009, the Party of No, the Senate Republicans, paralyzed the country, filibustering our political process—80 percent of major legislation filibustered.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Founders of our Nation intended for the Senate to be a moderating influence on the process of legislating. So they gave Senators 6-year terms of office. At the same time, they gave House Members 2-year terms of office so that they could be closest to the will of the people. The Senate was to be the deliberative body.

George Washington is said to have argued that the Senate would cool legislation as a saucer cools hot tea. In that same spirit, James Madison explained that the Senate would be a necessary fence against the fickleness and passion of American politics. Yet the Senate no longer cools the tea of legislation. It freezes it cold—solid. It is no longer a fence against fickle passions; it is an impenetrable wall which is obstructing progress.

The prerogative of a single Senator to single-handedly block any bill is an affront to democracy. It is clear that the minority party, utterly incapable of governing effectively while in power, has decided to obstruct those of us who are here to solve problems. The filibuster is their weapon of choice. This week, we are witnessing what must surely have been one of the most shameless exploitations of the filibuster in American history.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening after witnessing this shameless exploitation with sadness in my heart, with sadness at the absurd posturing of my friend, the retiring Senator from Kentucky, who has single-handedly blocked passage of highway jobs investment, unemployment insurance, and health coverage for Americans who have lost their jobs.

□ 1945

When this Senator and when the previous administration were running this country, they threw wild pitch after wild pitch—an unnecessary \$3 trillion war; runaway spending that turned a healthy surplus into a massive deficit; massive tax cuts for the rich that were not paid for; utter mismanagement of the economy; financial crisis and devastation to Main Street America—one wild pitch after another.

So the American people went to the bullpen. They put a pitcher with better stuff on the mound. He was a lefty, but he is throwing strikes straight down the middle with speed and accuracy.

But now the Senator is looking to get back into the game, and he has thrown a beanball straight down the

throats of the American people. This week, in the midst of a deep recession, thousands of jobs have been furloughed, millions of unemployed Americans have feared the loss of their lifelines, their unemployment benefits, and construction projects ground to a halt.

All because a single, lame-duck Senator—ostracized even within his own party—wants some attention.

Well tonight I have an urgent message for the American people.

Call him. Call Senator BUNNING. Tell him Americans are suffering. Tell him Americans have no patience for his shameless games. Tell him America will not be held hostage. Tell him to be part of the solution or to get out of the way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INDIANA HELPS ACHIEVE STATEHOOD FOR TEXAS BY ONE VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members that I admire the most is my good friend from Texas, Mr. POE. He is a real patriotic guy, and tonight he made a great speech on the independence of Texas. One of the things I would like to talk about real briefly is how Indiana had a hand in Texas becoming a free State, a free country.

Back when Texas was debating whether or not they should become an independent country and ultimately a State of the Union, we had a real contested election in Scott County, Indiana. The guy that was running for State representative of Scott County went around door-to-door, and he knocked on this one door and a man was in bed, he was very ill and about to die.

When he asked for this man's vote, the man said, "How do you feel about Texas being admitted to the Union?" The fellow running for State representative said, "I am for Texas being admitted to the Union." And the guy said, "I am going to vote for you."

On election day, the man was on his deathbed, and he was literally carried to the polls and he voted for the gentleman who said he was going to vote for admission of Texas to the Union, and he was elected by one vote.

He went to the State legislature and there was a great debate over who was going to be the State senator from Indiana. In those days, the State legislature decided who was going to be the Senator. The debate raged on for a long time, and it was decided that the man who was running for senator who want-

ed to admit Texas to the Union was elected by the State legislature by one vote.

He went to the United States Senate and they debated the issue of Texas being admitted to the Union for a long time, and, as my colleague just said, Texas was admitted to the Union by one vote.

So when people tell you one vote doesn't matter, I hope they will remember that Texas was admitted to the Union by one vote, as Mr. POE just talked about a few minutes ago, and the man from Indiana who was the United States senator who was for Texas being admitted to the Union, he was elected to the U.S. Senate by the Indiana legislature by one vote, and the man who was a State representative who cast the vote that put him in the United States Senate was elected in Scott County, Indiana, by one vote.

Although I wouldn't want to take credit for Texas being a part of the Union because of Indiana, I did want to say to my good colleague from Texas tonight that Indiana did have a role in electing Texas to the United States of America. So I am very happy that tonight we celebrate the admission of Texas into the Union. And I must say to my colleague, don't ever forget that the United States of America got the great State of Texas because Indiana put a Senator there who voted for Texas by one vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMEMORATING LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, as a proud graduate of Louisiana State University and LSU Medical School, I am honored to stand before the House today to thank my colleagues for commemorating LSU's 150th anniversary.

Since its first session in 1860, LSU has become the flagship university for our State, with over 650 endowed chairs and professorships held by distinguished faculty in disciplines that support the culture, government, and economy of Louisiana.

With more than 300 student organizations on campus, LSU plays a major

role in our community. The Ag Center, for example, has conducted research which has resulted in greater yields and incomes for farmers across the world.

It operates the Safety Net Hospital System for the State of Louisiana, caring for the uninsured and under-insured in our State and sometimes surrounding States.

After Hurricane Katrina, LSU operated the Nation's largest field hospital and enrolled student evacuees from other universities who couldn't return to devastated areas in our State.

In addition to its excellent academic programs, LSU is renowned for its athletic achievements.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to reflect the proper spelling of our motto, which reflects not only our affection for LSU, but our French culture. When I say *Geaux Tigers*, it is *G-E-A-U-X Tigers*.

With that Mr. Speaker, *Geaux Tigers*, and I yield back.

A SECOND OPINION ON HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader for giving me the opportunity to spend some time with my colleagues tonight on the House floor talking about, yes, one of the most important issues not just of the day, but of the year, and in fact the past year-and-a-half, and that is, of course, the issue of health care in this country.

Colleagues, I know that we all watched very closely, as did men and women across the country last Thursday, when there was a health care summit at the Blair House. Leadership from both the majority Democratic Party and the minority Republican Party, my party, were invited to the White House, about 20 on each side of the aisle, moderated by none other than the President himself.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that was a good thing. I commend the President for calling that summit. I think that each side, leadership and Members, particularly I think my colleagues from the Senate and our colleagues from the House, the medical doctors, did a great job of explaining their view and position on health care reform, alternative ideas which I think the President listened very carefully to.

It is hard to know what actually came out of that particular session, seven hours of dialogue, the whole thing televised. But, again, Mr. Speaker, I think it was good that we showed that there can be some comity and bipartisanship in this body and in the Congress. Indeed, it was a good opportunity.

Well, here we are almost a week later and we get an announcement from the

Associated Press just moments ago, Mr. Speaker. I was reading my *BlackBerry*, and apparently the President is going to come forward tomorrow yet again with some change to the health care plan even different from the 11-page change to the Senate bill that was posted on the Internet last Monday in anticipation of the health care summit on Thursday. I don't know what that is going to say, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the President has in mind. Maybe we will spend a little bit of time this evening talking about that.

I am pleased that my good friend and fellow physician co-member of the House GOP Doctors Caucus and fellow OB-GYN specialist from the great State of Tennessee, Dr. PHIL ROE, has joined me, and we will engage in a colloquy.

But I just wanted to kind of set the stage tonight for our colleagues and say to both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, and also to the administration, especially to the administration and to the President, again, I am not sure what we will see tomorrow, Mr. President. I look forward to very carefully looking at any proposals, especially if they are adopting some Republican ideas so that we can do these things, these important things for the American people, in a bipartisan way. We were elected to do that.

But I would very much liked to have been at the Blair House last Thursday. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the President knows that, or at least some of his staff knows. I don't know if he ever got to read my letter when I requested to come and speak on behalf of the Doctors Caucus in the House on the Republican side. I didn't get to go, but Dr. CHARLES BOUSTANY, our colleague from Louisiana, a cardiothoracic surgeon, was there, and did a great job. I am awfully proud of Dr. BOUSTANY.

But had I been there, had I had that opportunity to get my 5 minutes of fame or whatever, I would have said to the President, You know, one thing that you have done that I think is probably one of the most important things in regard to health care reform, that is money that was allocated, \$19 billion in fact, to try to get electronic medical records in the hands of every practicing physician in this country, all 750,000 of them, and every hospital in this country, so that we could clearly reduce medical errors, we could ultimately save lives, and, in the long run, save money.

This is an idea that I think, at least from this Republican viewpoint, Mr. Speaker, is bipartisan, and I commend the President. President Bush had the same idea, and again it was a plan to get fully integrated medical records by the year 2014-2015. So we can do things in a bipartisan way.

There are a number of other things that Dr. ROE and I would like to talk about, Mr. Speaker, tonight. We don't need to spend \$1 trillion. That expenditure on electronic medical records is something like \$20 billion. Now, \$20 bil-

lion is a lot of money, but it is a long way from a thousand billion, and that is a conservative estimate by the CBO: \$1 trillion for this 2,700-page reform. We don't need that, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I am not sure what the President is going to say tomorrow, but I hope that finally he will be listening to the American people and realize that there are some targeted things that were mentioned, yes, by Democrats and Republicans, but the President I think wants to adopt some Republican ideas, and we are talking about things especially like medical liability reform.

The CBO gave a very conservative estimate of saving \$54 billion over 10 years. But if it is the kind of medical liability reform that is comprehensive, fair, absolutely fair and balanced, so that patients who are injured by practitioners of medicine and by facilities that are practicing below the standards of care, that they absolutely have a redress of their grievances and a decent recovery.

But the President, Mr. Speaker, in the bills that we are currently looking at, the House and Senate bills, there is just a pittance, like \$25 million worth of grants to States to look at it, to study. We keep creating these study commissions, but not even allowing States who have already capped non-economic damages, so-called pain and suffering—in many instances these are these frivolous lawsuits—those States wouldn't even be eligible for any of this \$23 million in grants.

So I hope his comments tomorrow include adoption in a new bill or a modification, and hopefully a vast shrinkage of the existing bill, and that it is true medical liability reform.

□ 2000

Because that's the only way we save lives and save money and bend that cost curve down in the right direction.

So with those opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to yield time to my colleague from Tennessee, Representative PHIL ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY, for yielding. As I was sitting here, I think what we should do is go back a year. Obviously, last year when we first began this session we knew that health care reform was going to be on the front burner. The arguments that I heard for the need of it being on the front burner were the same as I heard over 20 years ago, which were rising costs of care, decreased access to care. And we have viewed those things, I think, over a period of time and understand that we have the best quality health care in the world in the United States, but it is expensive. So the cost is a huge issue. And that's one of the things that I think in this current bill is not being addressed adequately, or has not been.

One of the great disappointments I had during the debate on this health care bill was the fact that in our Doctors Caucus on the Republican side we have 14 Members, now 10 physicians.

We have an optometrist, dentist, psychologist. And not any of us were consulted in any meaningful way in putting together, on the House side, an over-2,000-page bill.

Let's summarize that bill a little bit. The House bill that was passed has a public option in there. That is not the case in the Senate bill. In the Senate bill and the House bill there are both individual and business mandates to purchase insurance. We have never in the history of this country on a Federal level—and you hear it compared to a State issue of car insurance. It's not the same thing. We've never done that before. So there are some distinct differences in these two bills. And they are now coming to the House. It passed in the House by 220-215; and in the Senate, 60-40.

Now the President, and Dr. GINGREY mentioned this, several of us have attempted on numerous occasions to go to the White House and sit down in a bipartisan manner and lay out literally hundreds of years of experience and go over with him what we saw work and what didn't work.

And what I saw in my State in Tennessee back 16 years ago was we looked at access, we look at rising costs, and people's inability—losing their insurance. The same issues as today. We asked for a waiver from the Health and Human Services to start a new managed care plan called TennCare. I've discussed it here on the House floor, and I'm not going to go into the details, but just to say that bill, that project, when it first started, was a \$2.6 billion project in the State of Tennessee to cover people. We had a lot of uninsured people. We wanted to get as many people covered as we could.

In doing that, in 10 budget years in the State of Tennessee that had gone to an \$8 billion program. It had tripled in costs. And so we found out unless people had some skin in the game, unless they had some different incentives than we had, the costs would escalate. As a matter of fact, it escalated so much that it took up one-third of the State budget, and every new State dollar we took in went to the health care. So the Governor, who's a Democrat, and the legislature, which was Democrat and Republican, split, had to do something about it because the State simply couldn't afford it.

What I see in this current Senate bill is a massive expansion of the same program that failed in the State of Tennessee. And to show you how bad it is right now in our State, we're having to limit doctors visits. That's right now, currently, I'm talking about. Not with this added part. Remember, in the Medicaid program, the State has a match. That's why the Nebraska carve-out was such a problem for other States, because there is a match that's required in Medicaid: the Federal Government provides so much money, the State provides so much. Well, our State can't provide any more. So we've cut the rolls of over 200,000 simply because the

State of Tennessee doesn't have the money for the current plan, not the very expansive plan that we've talked about.

I think last week—I agree with you, Dr. GINGREY, it was a year overdue. It should have happened a year ago. It was good going to show that there are philosophical differences between how you approach health care. Basically, do you want a larger—I won't say nanny State—but ever-expanding government to make those decisions, or individuals to make those decisions? Certainly, I believe that individuals should.

When you look at this plan that's there now, I can tell you it says it's budget neutral. There's some gimmicks that have been played. PAUL RYAN very clearly pointed those out in the \$500 billion that is being carved out of an already underfunded, failed Medicare plan; 2016, that goes upside down. In other words, more money is going out than coming in. If you take \$500 billion out of that, you've just created another liability for the Medicare program.

I will tell you, if you take that much money out, three things will occur. One, there will be decreased access to care because doctors are not going to be able to take the patients. They won't pay. Number two, the quality will go down if you can't go in. And, thirdly, the seniors will pay more for the care they're going to get because they'll have to. There won't be any other choice.

We talked about some simple things that I think we could do. As you pointed out already, there's a 2,700-page Senate bill out there. We can cover two-thirds of the people in that Senate bill with two paragraphs. Number one—and it's in the House bill—it's simply to allow young people who don't have health insurance after they get out of high school or college to stay on their parents' plan until they're 26 or 27 years old. Just pick your number. That will cover 7 million young people. Number two, sign up the people who are already eligible for SCHIP, the State Children's Health Insurance Plan, or Medicaid. Already you have got those plans in place. Have adequate funding. That will cover, Dr. GINGREY, almost 20 million people. This complicated Senate plan covers 31 million people.

You hear people talk about bending the cost curve, keeping costs down. Dr. GINGREY talked about it a little bit on medical liability reform. Without liability reform you will never be able to completely reverse this cost escalation. Why? Because doctors will order tests to protect them in case there's no disincentive for them not to. Again, an experience we've had in our State: 35 years ago we formed a mutual company, State Volunteer Mutual Insurance Company, to protect physicians. When I first went into practice, my premiums were about \$4,000 a year, probably much like yours were. When we left, a physician who took my place was \$74,000. It's gone up almost 18

times, over that period of 30 years, the increase in premiums.

And what have we gotten for that? Well, over half the premium dollars that I paid in for 35 years, gone for attorneys, both defense and plaintiff attorneys, not to the injured party. Less than forty cents on the dollar actually went to the injured party. So we've got a bad system to basically compensate people who have been legitimately injured. So until you get that fixed, you're not going to ever completely bend the cost curve. You've got that to deal with.

I think the waste and fraud, everyone agrees with that. There's waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare program, absolutely. I do have the President's letter. And the four things that he agreed to discuss were waste, fraud, and abuse. I think we all agree on that. Both sides. I don't think you'll get any disagreement there. The liability reform is just more study. The study that he was talking about was to not limit attorneys' contingency fees and caps on damages. Well, that's the two problems that are causing the problem right now. And in Texas, which we've already done the experiment, in 2003 they passed liability reform. And what's happened in Texas? Well, premiums have gone down 30 percent and physicians have streamed into Texas. Almost 15,000 new doctors have applied for practice in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the third thing that the President has in his letter is the inadequate payment for Medicaid patients. In our State, they pay less than 60 percent of the cost of actually providing the care. So physicians are not able to take as many of those patients, and many of them limit or don't see Medicaid patients. He said he would be willing to look at that if it's fiscally responsible. The other is to encourage health savings accounts, which has been one of the centerpieces of personal responsibility.

One of the things that has bothered me in this bill, that supposedly the President said in this chair here not long ago, that he wouldn't sign any legislation that wasn't budget neutral. Well, the sustainable growth rate, as you and I both know, are how doctors are paid by Medicare. As a matter of fact, right now there is no—we have had no "doc fix," we call it. There's a 21 percent cut in the budget right now for that that will occur this week if we don't do something this week. If there's a 21 percent cut in those payments to our physicians, then you're going to see a lot less Medicare patients have access to their doctors. And that is a very bad thing.

So I think there are some good things about what the President said here. I agree with that. Then there's some things that just don't mesh with the current legislation.

I want to talk about one other thing, and then I'll yield back. One of the things that when you see CBO and you see all these estimates, you have to go

back and just look at history. When Medicare was first debated on this very floor right here, and passed, it was a \$3 billion program. 1965. The estimates then were it would be a \$15 billion program in 1990. Flash forward to 1990. It was over a \$90 billion program. Today, it's over a \$400 billion program.

So if you look at those estimates and look at the history of our estimate in Tennessee that we were going to actually save money, keep premiums down. And, Dr. GINGREY, what's happened when the bigger—these programs that come along that don't pay the cost of the care. Medicare pays about 80, 90 percent of the cost of providing the care, and TennCare or Medicaid pays about 60 percent of the cost. Those costs get shifted. And they get shifted to business and individuals. We think, in Tennessee, it might add as much as \$1,800 per family who have private health insurance. So it's a hidden tax. We can't continue to do that, or you'll drive the insurance companies out of business.

Certainly, the insurance companies, we have every right, I think, to look at them very seriously. I know when I left practice, I had a case, and one of the last cases I did, I spent as much time getting the case approved as I did actually doing the case, almost. So there's some insurance reforms that need to be out there. You've experienced the same exact thing. A lot of frustration on my part there, also.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, thank you so much. I hope you will be able to stay with us for a little bit more time tonight as we continue the colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to show a few slides to our colleagues. Of course, starting with the Second Opinion, the subtitle: When will the White House listen to the American people? When, indeed, Mr. Speaker, will the White House listen to the American people?

In the second slide, let's just go back to last August, 7 months ago. Americans attended town hall meetings across the country in record numbers. In fact, my town hall meetings, instead of having 40 or 50 people there, I had 1,500. And I'm sure other Members experienced the same thing. These people were asking that the Democratic majority stop their plans to implement a government takeover of health care. And here's a quote, Mr. Speaker, from ABC News, and the date is August 5, 2009. That's when all these town hall meetings were going on across the country. I quote from the newspaper, There were no lobbyist-funded buses in the parking lot of Mardela Middle and High School on Tuesday evening, and the hundreds of eastern Maryland residents who packed the school's auditorium loudly refuted the notion that their anger over the Democrat health care reform plan is manufactured. That's what ABC News was saying back 6 months ago.

Now fast forward to today, March 2, 2010. Americans are still trying to be

heard by the White House and Democratic leaders as Democrats continue to try and ram a government takeover of health care through the Congress by any way possible. This is a quote from Rasmussen, the polling guru. Everybody's familiar with the Rasmussen poll: February 23, 2010, just last week, Voters still strongly oppose the health care reform plan proposed by President Obama and congressional Democrats and think Congress should focus instead on a smaller plan, smaller bills, that address problems individually rather than a comprehensive plan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's what we're talking about tonight, that's what Dr. ROE is discussing, that's what I said in my opening remarks, about had I been at the Blair House, what I might have said, very respectfully, to the President, to Majority Leader REID, and to the Speaker of this House of Representatives, Ms. PELOSI.

□ 2015

The American people were not an angry mob, as they are not today, my colleagues. They are men and women, a lot of seniors, yes, very concerned about the massive takeover by the government. And that is the thing, the bottom line that the people fear the most, is having government take over every aspect of our lives. Indeed, colleagues, we are talking about, and we all hear this quote and don't argue with the statistics, this is one-sixth of our economy; \$2.5 trillion a year on health care.

We see the same thing, quite honestly, happening in education. We have a bill on the floor tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, a bill with a special rule in regard to telling school systems all across this country how they can discipline children. I am sure there are some concerns and there may be some abusive behavior in very small pockets and a small problem. But we have this attitude up here, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government knows best, and we have these knee-jerk reactions to things, and all of a sudden we make this huge mountain out of a mole hill, I think, in some instances and say the Federal Government has to take over; that school boards, elected by a local community, can't run their local schools. I think that is hogwash, quite honestly.

The American people have spoken about this. They want us to correct the things that they can't deal with themselves. And yes, they want us, Mr. Speaker, to rein in the abuses, in this instance, of the health insurance industry. But you have to understand, colleagues, that there are a lot of good, honest, ethical men and women in this country who work in the insurance industry, whether they are selling life insurance or property and casualty, or health insurance. Independent agents.

And there are some great health insurance companies, large companies, small companies, probably over 3,000

total. We need to be careful that we're not beating up on them so bad that all of a sudden we destroy an industry, and how many hundreds of thousands of jobs in the process.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I would be proud to yield for comments from my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. You make a great point. We are not here defending them. But to put this in perspective, if you took all the profits that the health insurance industry made, it would be 2 days of the health care of this country. That is how much it is: 2 days out of 365.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. This is the kind of wisdom that we need to hear and need to stop and think.

Certainly Dr. ROE would agree, and I fully agree, Mr. Speaker, that if insurance companies are rescinding, is the word that is used, a rescission action, rescinding a policy after the fact. Somebody has got health insurance for their family, including their children, and they have a teenage daughter, and she, lo and behold, has to go into the hospital for an emergency appendectomy. The surgery is a success, everything goes fine, and they expect that the insurance company will pay whatever is above the copay and the deductible. And then all of a sudden they are told, "Well, no, we've looked back through your policy that you took out, Dad, for the family 10 years ago when your teenager was just 3, and you gave us the wrong birth date, or you failed to dot an I or cross a T, and therefore this \$20,000 bill, you're on your own, buddy." Well, that has to stop. Of course it has to stop.

And this also not allowing people with preexisting conditions, particularly if they are in the individual market, just make it so impossible, either deny or make the premiums four times the standard rate, and that essentially is denial, too, isn't it, Mr. Speaker? Well, Dr. ROE and I agree, and everybody in this body, all 435 of us agree that we need to stop things like that. Those things can be done, but it doesn't take 2,700 pages and 32 additional Federal bureaucracies to deal with that.

Again, I don't know what the President is going to say tomorrow. I read that AP report that he is going to indeed address four subjects in maybe yet another bill, or maybe in addition to the current Senate bill, that were brought up last week on Thursday at the Blair House by the Republican Members that were there. Let me just on my BlackBerry, Mr. Speaker, refer to that. And just for my colleagues, maybe some of you had already read that.

The proposals President Obama listed are four: Number one, sending investigators disguised as patients to uncover fraud and waste. I want to get

back to that, Mr. Speaker, in just a minute. Expanding medical malpractice reform pilot programs. Sounds good to me. Increasing payments to Medicaid providers. Absolutely. If we are going to have any Medicaid providers, I hope we will do that. And last, the fourth thing, and I am really interested in reading about this because I'm most in favor of it, expanding the use of health savings accounts.

But I do want to go back to that first one, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Sending investigators disguised as patients to uncover fraud, waste, and abuse. I know that was brought up at the Blair House by a Republican, but, quite honestly, if we don't already, Mr. Speaker, have enough Inspector Generals within CMS and other government programs, health care, TRICARE, the veterans program, CHIP program across the country, I think we could do a better job with combating waste, fraud and abuse than sending undercover patients into doctors' offices.

I haven't practiced in a while, but I spent 31 years, Mr. Speaker, as a medical practitioner, it has only been 7 or 8 years since I practiced, but I worried all the time about making sure that I didn't make a mistake, that I ordered the sufficient number of tests. And in fact, I practiced like everybody else, probably Dr. ROE as well, I welcome his comments on this, what we call defensive medicine. And many times getting a blood test, or an x-ray, or a CAT scan, or an MRI, or something that I knew wasn't necessary. I hoped that it wouldn't be harmful to the patient. If you draw too much blood, you can certainly turn them into an anemic patient.

And, Lord knows, we had a hearing just last week, Mr. Speaker, in the Energy and Commerce Committee about x-ray exposure, particularly from MRIs and CAT scans and things that you really don't know if 10, 15, 20 years from now if that exposure couldn't indeed lead to a cancer that that patient might not otherwise have contracted. So all of that defensive medicine that we practice, and my colleagues, the OB/GYN specialists, are in town this week, and I have had the conversation with them, so I know that we need to stop that.

But this business of saying we're going to disguise people and have them go into a doctor's office as a fake patient, I sure hope they don't go in as a fake patient and decide to have a hemorrhoidectomy to see whether or not the doctor is qualified. Some of this stuff is a little bit ridiculous, I think.

I want to yield to my colleague from Tennessee, because he's got almost as much clinical experience as I have. I would like to know how he feels about that particular aspect of reducing waste, fraud, and abuse.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would like to go on record tonight with you as naming this ramming this bill through this month March Madness. And I am

not talking about basketball. It would be madness to do that now. And I will just tell you why I believe that.

Six o'clock the night after that summit last week, I just happened to have a telephone town hall and had 1,100 people vote in a poll. There were four questions: Number one, do you want to pass this bill as it is? Number two, do you want to take a clean sheet of paper and start over? Number three, do you want to just scrap it and work on jobs? Or number four, do you not have an opinion on this? Five percent of those 1,100 people who voted said to pass the bill as is. Thirty-eight percent said get a clean piece of paper and start over. Fifty-two percent said just stop altogether and let's get to working on getting people back to work in this country; start on jobs. And then 5 percent were undecided.

As you can see, that CNN poll right there showed 73 percent of Americans think we should start all over or do nothing. So it is not that much different than the very poll I did of 1,100 people voting. Mine was not a scientific poll. I want to point that out. It was just a telephone town hall poll. I don't want to pass it off as anything it is not.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Thank you for sharing that with our colleagues in regard to the tele-town hall meeting and the poll that you conducted with your constituents in Tennessee. You referred to this next slide that I have got titled, and I want to point it out to my colleagues, "What Americans Want." Just like Dr. ROE said, poll numbers, 73 percent of Americans think Congress should start over on health care reform, or if they can't start over and get it right, do nothing.

I mean for goodness sakes, this business of when you are talking about health care and somebody comes along and says to you, "Do something, even if it's wrong," think about that for a minute. Do something even if it's wrong? Regarding health care? Regarding an operation? Regarding a delivery of a child? No. Don't do something even if it's wrong. You better get it right. And if you can't get it right with what your plan is, drop the plan.

Then going on the bottom half of this slide, Mr. Speaker, 56.4 percent of people indicated they would prefer Congress to tackle health care reform on a step-by-step basis, not take the comprehensive approach as embodied in legislation that passed the House and Senate last year but is now stalled, thank God, for the past month.

I want to yield to my colleague so he can further elaborate on this.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you for yielding.

One of the things that is not mentioned in the President's letter that I am looking at here is that certainly people who are either pro-choice or pro-life do not want, a vast majority do not want taxpayer dollars spent on federally funding abortions. The way the Senate bill is written, the way the

House bill without the Stupak amendment, it does do that. The Stupak amendment in the House bill forbids that. The Senate bill does not. And nowhere in this language—why can't we just come out and say a vast majority of the people do not want that? And we should be able to come out and say that no Federal dollars will be used to fund abortions in this health care takeover. I think that is fairly simple.

We saw how the Stupak amendment passed with an overwhelming majority in the House. It did not do so in the Senate. But I think that is fairly simple. We ought to be able to say that. The President ought to be able to say that right now, tomorrow. He should be able to come out and say just that.

The second thing you brought up a moment ago were preexisting conditions. That is for you and I, where I would see it as a physician would be in a patient I diagnosed and would have a breast cancer and maybe lost her job or retired from teaching or whatever it may be, and then she is uninsurable. Well, that is unacceptable. That is absolutely unacceptable. I fought with that for 30 years in practice. Preexisting conditions are a problem in the individual market. The year I ran for Congress, I was in the individual market. It was tough to find insurance. It is expensive, and most people can't afford it. And small businesses. Seventy percent of our jobs are from small businesses. So how do you create a situation where small businesses can afford this and become larger groups?

□ 2030

Well, I know it doesn't make sense, and I have never been able to understand why anybody would care if you sell insurance across the State line. I use the example of Bristol, Tennessee and Virginia. There is a city in my district where State Street has a line right down the middle of the street. On one side, you are in Virginia, and on one side, you are in Tennessee. One side you've got a different insurance policy than the other side of the street. That makes absolutely no sense. You don't get your homeowners that way, your life insurance. Car insurance you can buy across State lines. It makes no sense.

I can see why the insurance industry wouldn't want you to do that because it creates competition. And then what you allow people to do once they can shop across State lines, because there are vast differences, you can get on the Internet and find out what a life insurance policy costs you anywhere in the country. You can evaluate whether the company is solid or not, and you know what you're buying. You can find out. It is transparent.

We need transparency in insurance rates, and we need to allow small businesses to form groups. You can call them association health plans, group plans or whatever. But if you can spread those risks over thousands of people, then the preexisting condition

goes away. And I can't imagine why anybody would object to that. That's not here in the President's plan. He's got this exchange that's government regulated instead of the free market regulation. I think that's a huge difference in the way we look at this. Do we want government regulating it? Yeah, you want some. We have anti-trust laws. Absolutely you do. But we want the free market to work because it works much more efficiently, and that's two of the basic differences in these two—

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, if you will yield back to me for just a second, I want to continue on this point that you are making. I think what you just said, if I understand it correctly, Mr. Speaker—what Dr. ROE just said is that if we would allow individuals to go online, they wouldn't have to get in their car. I wouldn't have to drive to Tennessee to apply, to sign up for a health insurance policy that's offered in Tennessee. From the comfort of your home, you do it over the Internet.

And if we would simply allow that—and also, by the way, allow small employers that maybe employ 10 or 15 people to come together with others in what we refer to as an association—and very quickly, you could get to 1,000 or more and form an association, and that way you spread the risk. You have some people that have preexisting conditions. You have some people that have had a heart attack or already have high blood pressure or whatever. But if you spread it among 1,000 people, you have lots of healthy people in that association, so you are able to bring down the cost.

And the same thing with individuals being able to buy across State lines because they're part of a—people all across the country in every one of the 50 States might be getting on that computer and buying a plan that's offered in the State of Tennessee or in the State of Georgia. And that way, as I understand what Dr. ROE is saying, Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't need these exchanges because that would be the exchange.

And then to sort of complete the thought, you also—within every State, or you could come together on a regional basis if you wanted to with neighboring States. You could have these high-risk pools within the State so that individuals that do have these preexisting conditions, these insurance companies, health insurance companies that offer their products within a State, they would have to participate, and they would have to agree that, Hey, you take one high-risk patient; I will take a high-risk patient. You take another one; I will take another one. And do it in a fair and balanced way and not have the premiums be more than, say, 2, 2½ times the most standard rates. Then if they are low-income, but yet they don't qualify for Medicaid because they're not quite that low but they certainly can't afford the premium, then the State and the Federal

Government can help with some subsidies. But not this business of \$500 billion worth of subsidies. That's what's causing this bill to be so expensive. In fact, you know, you cut money out of Medicare, \$500 billion out of Medicare, tax the American people \$500 billion.

So, Mr. Speaker, Dr. ROE is offering us—it's a Republican idea, yeah, but it ought to be bipartisan. And we talked about it at the Blair House last week. So we really don't need these exchanges, do we, Dr. ROE? And I will yield back to you.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I can't imagine why anybody would mind if you bought your health insurance exactly like you buy any other insurance policy you want to. I don't know how you could possibly object to that. Let's take Realtors, for instance. Almost all realty shops are small businesses. In our community, 10 or 15 people would be a large realty store. There are over 500,000 Realtors in America. If they could come together as an association and buy their insurance through that exchange or through that association, I should say, preexisting conditions would go away. It's just not an issue if you've got 100,000, 200,000 people.

People talk about the FEHBP, the plan that the Federal Government has. That is the same thing. You have 9 million people in that plan. You share those risks, and you can then negotiate lower rates.

Another thing I think that we need to talk about tonight are health savings accounts. I want to talk about that for just a minute because most people don't really understand it. You hear it's just for rich people and so on. That's a big argument you hear. Let me explain to people what a health savings account really is.

You are given money, whatever the number is. The way we've done since World War II is that we've gotten our insurance and we pay a small copay or deductible, and it is 80 percent up to a certain point and then it's 100 percent after that. Well, that means at the end of the year, if you have been totally well, the insurance company keeps all your money. That's your money you are paying in, and you are getting some of that in lieu of a salary. What that HSA does is, let's say you put \$3,000 or \$5,000 in. I have had a health savings account, and we put \$5,000 in that health savings account. If you got sick and used the \$5,000, you would pay 100 percent after that. So that is my money I am dealing with. At the end of the year, if I have been healthy, I have had a healthy lifestyle, I don't smoke, I exercise, I eat well, take care of myself, I get to keep the money. I roll it over, and then next year I can use it. And after a number of years, you may have many thousands of dollars that you can use for long-term care.

Now, again, the argument I hear is that only rich people do that. Well, let's look at my own office. We have 300 or so people that get insurance through our medical practice, and 84 percent

use a health savings account. They manage their own health care dollars. They like it a lot because they then become negotiators for their health care costs. They come to my office, and they may negotiate a price for a visit. They may go to whatever procedure they may have. They may go to the hospital and say, I want your lowest price, and they can get that by negotiations, and that will bend the cost curve down. What continually makes the cost curve go up is that we're shielded from all the costs of the health care.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, if you will yield back, and I think you make a good point. And I hear the same argument. Well, only people that are well-to-do, well-off, high-income people can afford to have a health savings account in combination, Mr. Speaker, with that low monthly premium and a high deductible that Dr. ROE just explained so well. But I have seen statistics, and I think they're accurate, that 50 percent of people that have these high deductible, low monthly premium combined with a health savings account make less than \$50,000 a year. And some 75 percent of them make less than \$75,000 or \$80,000 a year. So we're not talking about wealthy people. I think Dr. ROE makes a good point.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, as I was reading in the Associated Press about what the President might include tomorrow, these four things I did ridicule a bit, this idea of combating waste, fraud, and abuse with fake patients. I have embellished or maybe overstated, but I wanted to make a point, Mr. Speaker. But as far as expansion of health savings accounts, I say to the President, Kudos, Mr. President. I am looking forward to hearing about that, and I hope that this report from the Associated Press is true.

I also hope, Mr. President, that the report about expanding the medical liability reform is true, although I would guess that it doesn't go nearly far enough, because this report, if it's accurate, Mr. Speaker, says instead of \$23 million worth of grants to States to enact pilot programs on alternative ways of dealing with medical liability issues, it increases that amount to \$50 million. Well, that's not much, and that's not really, I don't think—and I think Dr. ROE would agree with me—going nearly far enough to do what we need to do in regard to caps on pain and suffering judgments, which sometimes can be in the millions of dollars in a frivolous case.

And then a couple of other issues, Mr. Speaker, regarding medical liability reform. The defendant in a medical malpractice case could include somebody that was just covering—let's say as an example, Dr. ROE has a patient and asked Dr. GINGREY to step in and say hello to that patient on Sunday morning while Dr. ROE takes his family to church, and Dr. ROE is going to operate on that patient the next day. Dr.

GINGREY just walks by and says hello to the patient and lets her know that Dr. ROE will be in later in the evening, and that's the only contact that Dr. GINGREY has with this particular patient. Well, if something, Mr. Speaker—and it's not likely that anything would go wrong under the care of a doctor like Dr. ROE, but sometimes things do, and that Dr. GINGREY who just really had essentially nothing to do with the patient's care would be drug into court. And if he or she had the deepest pockets and the most liability coverage, then they would be the ones that would be responsible for most of the judgment and settlement or whatever. So we need some robust reform. And I hope that the President, Mr. Speaker, is talking about that.

I yield back to my friend to see what his thoughts are on that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will just point out the California experiment. They did caps on pain and suffering in 1976, and premiums across the country for malpractice have gone up over 1,000 percent during that time. In California, it was about 300 percent. So it's been a huge decrease. Texas was similar. They have had a 30 to 50 percent reduction in malpractice premiums. And doctors—especially high-risk doctors like yourself and myself—many counties in Texas now have an obstetrician which before they did not have. Over half the counties in the State of Tennessee do not have an OB/GYN doctor in the county. So it is an access inequality problem when you can't get to a doctor. And many of our physicians are leaving the practice, which is very worrisome, because you want your most experienced people staying with it.

We have another problem, I think, with this plan. I do believe that from what I have heard in my own district, there is no question. I came out of church the week before Christmas, and one of my friends there said, Doc, he said to me, What's the Senate going to do with this health care bill? This is after the House had passed it, and it was about Christmas Eve when they were getting ready to vote. And I said, Well, I think that they're going to try to fix it. He grabbed me by my shirt, by my coat lapels, and he said, You fix your cat. You kill this bill. What he was saying was that this comprehensive, almost incomprehensible bill needed to be shelved, and we needed to start from scratch and go all over.

I think last week was a start, but it was a year too late. You had so many people that had put their neck out and said this absolutely has to be in a bill when it didn't have to be. I can think of four or five things we ought to be able to agree on in a minute, and those would be selling across State lines. I think certainly forming association health plans, doing away with pre-existing conditions. I think we all can agree on that. I think meaningful malpractice reform we can agree on. I think letting young people stay on

their parents' health plan until age 27. I think just signing up people who currently are eligible for the current programs we already have. Those are five things right there that we ought to be able to agree on in a minute and we can do.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, yielding back to me for a second, we've already talked about the health savings plans and expanding that and allowing people—if there still is an exchange, and you and I have talked about it, Mr. Speaker. Dr. ROE and I have talked about it, and I hope our colleagues understand this. We don't think that we have to have this exchange, this expensive exchange where you have to subsidize people's premiums. That's how the President was able to say last week, Mr. Speaker, that 47 percent of people in the exchange will be paying less than they currently are for their health insurance. Well, yeah, they are paying less out of their pockets, but they're reaching in everybody else's pockets—John Q. Taxpayer—to help them pay those premiums. So really when you do a little fact check on that, you find that most people under that plan are going to end up paying more.

And what Dr. ROE is talking about in the four or five things he mentioned, of course, even if you had an exchange, you shouldn't say to people that the only kind of policy that they can buy is a first dollar coverage, the most expensive kind of policy, when young people, healthy people and people who are just out of college or just out of high school or just back from the military and they are trying to pay for a car, they're trying to rent an apartment or buy a little starter home, or buy an engagement ring for their fiancée, and the last thing they can afford is \$15,000 a year for a first dollar coverage health insurance plan that they don't even need. So what's still in the bill, it prohibits a person from having one of these plans.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. It's counterintuitive, isn't it, Dr. ROE?

And I yield back to you.

□ 2045

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. One of the things that this plan does, it mandates a certain level of coverage. You have to purchase a certain level of coverage, and it is a fairly expensive piece of coverage. An example would be for fertility. I can assure you that in my family, we don't need that coverage. I should be able to purchase the coverage that I need. There are issues in there that I just don't need any more. For example, pregnancy coverage is something I don't need. I should be able to go buy, or a person should be able to go buy, just like when they buy the homeowner's policy that they need, that is what they purchase. You should be able to do the same thing for health insurance.

That is one of the problems with mandates. Some States have as many as 60 State mandates that you have to have in an insurance policy to sell insurance in that State. One of the problems with it is if you are allowed to buy across State lines, you can go buy a policy that fits your needs and your family's needs. You make that decision; the government doesn't make it for you.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. That is exactly right, Dr. ROE. I have a daughter who lives in the great State of New York. Her health insurance policy covers so much more than many of the policies cover in the State of Georgia, for example. And it is much, much, more expensive as a result of that. So Dr. ROE makes a good point of buying across State lines.

One thing before our time expires, Mr. Speaker. I want to just say again that hope springs eternal. I don't know what the President is going to say to us tomorrow, but I hope that I like what I hear because the American people need relief. But as we stand here tonight, what is still in these bills? Well, a government takeover, that is one thing. Price controls is another. Individual and employer mandates, and I don't know that it is really even constitutional to say to an individual in this country you, under the penalty of law, fines, and jail time, have to buy health insurance. We hope they do, and we hope we create the environment where we can bring down the price and people can afford—maybe it is a health savings account combined with a high deductible, low monthly premium, but to hold a gun to their head and say they have to do it, no, that is not right. That is not constitutional.

In the bill, there is no meaningful medical liability reform. Again, hope springs eternal, but the bill puts Washington bureaucrats in charge of defining quality health care. That is where those 32 new bureaucracies do their work. It cuts \$500 billion over all Medicare, but \$120 billion of that is cut out of Medicare Advantage, and 20 percent of our seniors get their care from Medicare Advantage. Why do they call it Advantage? Because it is an advantage. It covers wellness. It does screening, appropriate screening. It keeps people healthy so they are not spending all of that money in the last weeks or months of their life.

Finally, this bill raises taxes to pay for new entitlement programs, and it gives the government-run plan a beachhead to eliminate the private insurance market. And, unfortunately, many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have said it loud and clear, whether members of Energy and Commerce, or Ways and Means, or Education and Labor, that they want the government to take over, just like it exists in Great Britain or Canada or other countries. The American people don't want that. They want us to do something in an incremental way, and I think we can do it and do it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Just a very short comment. This weekend, Dr. GINGREY, Mr. Speaker, I had three friends, people I know, diagnosed with some very serious illnesses. It just happened. These three men that I know extremely well, all of them, are getting the highest quality care anywhere in the world, and they don't have to go far from home to get it. I think one of the things that the American health care system has brought to us are new innovations, lengthening of our life span, and the procedures that are done today to extend and improve the quality of life. I am glad to hear no longer, and I heard it for a year, and it was very bothersome and troublesome to me, to hear the other side talk about how bad health care was in America. We certainly have a problem getting health care at an affordable price to all of our citizens, there is no question that is true, but the care that everyone gets is good care.

I can tell you that I have done it myself for people who couldn't pay. And I would stand here and hear people talk, and I am one of the few people on this House floor who had to get up and go to the emergency room at 3 in the morning and see a patient who doesn't have health insurance and try to work him through a system and get them care. It isn't easy. We can do better, and we sure can do better than this bill right here.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank Dr. ROE for being with me tonight, Mr. Speaker. There are 14 health care providers on the Republican side. Ten of them are M.D.s. There are five M.D.s on the Democratic side. We have two doctors in the Senate. We probably have 500 years in clinical experience in the aggregate. Let us help.

In closing, I want to refer to my colleague who was here a number of years ago, Dr. Roy Rowland, a member of this body when the Democrats were in the majority. Back in the early 1990s, Dr. Rowland, a family practitioner from Dublin, Georgia, he had a bipartisan bill back then that he worked very closely on with his Democratic colleagues and his Republican colleagues, and he presented that bill. I think it was called the Bipartisan Health Reform Act of 1994, and he offered that in lieu of HillaryCare. Unfortunately, the Democratic majority didn't accept it. Don't make the same mistake this time, Mr. President. Let's do it in a bipartisan way and in a small, incremental way.

BLUEPRINT FOR RECOVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud to found the Populist Caucus with a large group of my friends in the Democratic Caucus to

focus on economic issues that affect Americans who either make up the middle class or are striving to enter the middle class. We all know that our country has historically been at its best when we have had a large middle class and our economic policies reflect middle class values, and that is why when we decided to settle upon our founding principles, we decided that we wanted to fight for families by providing them access to quality, affordable health care; to provide them and their children with the type of world class education they will need to compete in a global economy; to make sure that we have a fair wage system for all employees in this country; to make sure that our trade policies provide a level playing field to American workers and American manufacturers who compete with trading partners who just frankly don't quite live up to our standards, whether it is child labor, exploitation of workers, environmental issues, those are the types of issues that we want to focus on as we chart a new future for this country to promote and expand the middle class that we all are so proud to have been a part of.

One of the things that we talked about as we were trying to dig ourselves out of the greatest economic crisis since the Great Depression was what type of a blueprint for recovery we wanted to offer to the American people that was going to be a reflection of the values that we grew up with and give a strong message that, after a bailing out Wall Street, the American taxpayers deserved help on Main Street, and that it was not unreasonable to ask the very people on Wall Street who got us into this mess to help pay for the tab on helping bail out Main Street.

I am proud to be joined by my friends, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN), but one of the things that I want to talk about at the beginning is the things that we hear over and over back in our district, because all of us have been out talking to our constituents, going to town hall meetings, Congress on Your Corner and the other events, and the one thing I hear from my constituents over and over is this question: When do I get my bailout?

This is a legitimate question that Americans deserve an answer to from Democrats and Republicans, because if you are somebody who has lost your job or you've lost your home or you've lost your business or you've lost your health care coverage during this crisis, you need to know what is my Federal Government doing to help me out. So when we talk about our response, we are going to do it by talking about these three core values: The Populist Caucus wants to find a blueprint for recovery that is going to spur job creation; it is going to implement fair compensation for executives who helped put us in this problem; and, finally, bring an end to excessive Wall

Street speculation that drove our economy and drove the global economy off the cliff and put us into this deep hole that we have been digging ourselves out of.

So as millions of middle class families look to us and ask when their recovery effort will bring relief to their town on their street, they deserve to know what we are going to be doing to spur job creation, insist on fair executive compensation, and end speculation on Wall Street.

Now, one of the things that we know is that it is very common for politicians and groups across the political spectrum to try to claim the populist mantle. But let me tell you, and I am going to let my colleagues expand on this, the Populist Caucus that we all came together to found was not based upon a bunch of people running through the streets with torches and pitchforks asking for blood. We are there because the problems of the middle class are real. The concerns of our constituents reflect the concerns of America, and we want to come together and talk about serious answers to real problems to help change the lives of middle class Americans.

So with that, I am going to yield to my colleague from Ohio before I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin to talk about some of the critical economic issues she is hearing about from her constituents and why this Populist Caucus response is so critical moving forward.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for your strong leadership of the Populist Caucus and the mission that we are on to restore the promise of the middle class, to stand up for the middle class, and to stand up for those who aspire to the middle class, to make our country work for those folks who are aspiring to the middle class.

We are not something that is complicated. The Populist Caucus believes that strong, immediate action must be taken to create jobs in the United States and to put an end to the excessive greed of Wall Street that brought us to the brink of disaster. And so I am proud to join with you, Representative BRALEY and Representative KAGEN, to stand up and speak to the American people about the fight we are waging on their behalf because that's what being a populist is really about.

When I go home, as when you go home, I hear all about the need to facilitate employment opportunity for the people that I represent in northeast Ohio. All they want is a government that will work with them and for them, to facilitate those jobs, jobs, jobs that are so needed out there. We have heard recently that there is a recovery underway, and there are some signs of recovery, and we have certainly seen a lot of signs of recovery on Wall Street, but there can be no such thing as a jobless recovery, and we have started to hear that term bounced about.

The Populist Caucus is here to say that there is no recovery if our folks

don't have jobs, because this is not just about a country that stands up for the well-to-do. This is the People's House. This body is about making sure people have opportunity, ordinary people have opportunity. And what we will discuss, and when we look back a little bit, it becomes apparent that the economy, even before the excesses of Wall Street came to their full fruition, even before the economy was not working for ordinary Americans, we saw a decade of flat wages in this country while we continued to see skyrocketing health care costs. We saw the GDP rise, and we saw productivity rise in this country, but the American people who were doing the work were not sharing in the prosperity.

□ 2100

So we look forward to developing policies—and that's what the blueprint is all about—that will help deliver sustainable, quality jobs for the American people that will fairly compensate them and put an end to the excessive and disparate compensation that those at the top of the food chain have been taking for far too many years at the expense of everyone else.

And so with that, I yield back to the gentleman. And I thank you again for your leadership; it's been stellar on this subject. I look forward to the mission ahead.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I think one of the things that we've heard a lot about, Dr. KAGEN, is we've heard people try to explain what went wrong on Wall Street and this concept that sometimes big financial institutions are just too big to fail. Now, I don't know how it is up in northeastern Wisconsin; but in Iowa, if something is too big to fail, it's just too big. So maybe you can help enlighten us a little bit about some of the economic policies that we pursued as a country before Barack Obama became President that have contributed to the enormous challenge we have faced this past year in trying to stabilize the economy before we moved on to a broader response to real meaningful financial reform.

Mr. KAGEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for putting together the Populist Caucus.

Once again, as Mr. BRALEY has pointed out, we're populists because we are standing with our feet on the factory floor. We don't have our heads sitting in a board room on a corporation on Wall Street. We do not share their values. We have those working class values that ordinary people have.

This battle that we're in now, this battle for America's future to create the jobs that we need to work our way through today's troubled times and work our way back into prosperity, this battle that we're in didn't just start 10 years ago, it just didn't begin with 10 years of net zero job creation. I will take us back a century because it's really not 2010, it's 1910 all over again.

In the words of Teddy Roosevelt, who, on August 31, 1910, in his speech entitled, "The New Nationalism," set forward the idea of the progressive movement and the Populist Caucus—and I will quote him in part because it was a very long speech:

"Exactly as the special interests of cotton and slavery threatened our political integrity before the Civil War, so now the great special business interests too often control and corrupt the men and methods of government for their own profit. We must drive the special interests out of politics; that is one of our tasks today. Every special interest is entitled to justice, full, fair and complete. And now mind you, if there were any attempt by mob violence to plunder and work harm to the special interests, whatever it may be, that I most dislike. And the wealthy man, whomsoever he may be, for whom I have the greatest contempt, I would fight for him, and you would if you were worth your salt. He should have justice, for every special interest is entitled to justice, but not one is entitled to a vote in Congress, to a voice on the bench, or to representation in any public office. The Constitution guarantees protection to property, and we must make that promise good; but it does not give the right of suffrage to any corporation." We the people have rights, corporations don't.

Now, over the short period of history that we've been here in Congress, beginning in 2006, with Representatives SUTTON and BRALEY and WELCH, we took forward some ideas that we gathered from people. And everywhere I go in Wisconsin, Mr. BRALEY, people are telling me the same thing: We want our money back, we want our jobs back. For too long, our jobs have been shipped overseas. Instead of our values being shipped overseas, it's been our jobs. And here on my left is a short picture of where the jobs have gone.

During the previous administration under George Bush, just before President Obama came into office in January, we had lost 700,000-plus jobs; this January, 2010, 20,000. We are moving up in the right direction. And, yes, we need to generate more jobs, but how did we get into this mess that started really back in 1910 and we're not done yet? We've had two wars at the same time without paying a dime for it; we've had two tax cuts to the rich without paying for a penny; we've had a \$400 billion handout to the big drug companies on Wall Street without paying a nickel for it. And then at the tail end of the last administration we had a looting of the United States Treasury of nearly \$1 trillion while they fed their friends on Wall Street, again, without paying a single dime for it. Well, in Wisconsin, much like in Ohio and everywhere else across the country, including Iowa, we have a saying, you know, there is no free lunch, we have to pay our bills.

So we have to pay our bills, we have to live within our means; and to do

that, the Populist Caucus has put forward a blueprint for America's future, and I yield back my time.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Well, that's a great segue because we not only are talking about values; we are talking about solutions. We're talking about legislation that is going to help us create jobs by generating new revenues, not putting this on the back of the middle class, but helping the people who got us into this mess assume some of the responsibility. And I think one of the cornerstones of our blueprint for recovery is this issue of fair compensation. And my good friend from Vermont, Congressman PETER WELCH, has introduced a bill called Wall Street Bonus Tax Act. I am going to let him explain what that bill does and how it helps achieve this blueprint for recovery by putting some incentives for Wall Street to help rebuild Main Street.

Congressman WELCH, I yield to you at this time.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak about trying to get jobs to start going up along with the stock market.

You know, it was only 1 year ago in one week that Wall Street, the stock market was crashed to its lowest level in years. In that past year, it has recovered; but while it has recovered, unemployment is still hovering in the range of 10 percent, underemployment is in the range of 17 or 18 percent. There are over 27 million Americans who are seeking work or not working enough, and we are not going to have an economic recovery until those folks are back to work.

How did this happen? It happened, we know, because of the excessive lending, reckless lending largely engineered by Wall Street firms that stood to gain an awful lot of profit. What happened? We, the American taxpayer, had to bail out Wall Street, \$750 billion. People didn't want to do it, but they had a gun to the head of the American economy, and the collateral damage of inaction would have been much more havoc to people's pensions, to unemployment, and to Main Street. But 1 year later, Wall Street is back, but lending by Wall Street to our small businesses has gone down, not up. If we are going to get jobs back, if we are going to get people back to work, we need our banks—and it tends to be our local banks—to start doing some lending. They have been doing the job, but Wall Street hasn't.

What they've been doing in the past year—and quite successfully, they're very good at it—is returning to the casino economy. They've made an enormous amount of money by buying and selling derivatives, commodities, and currencies. And how did they do it? With the help of the American taxpayer: one, the \$750 billion TARP transfer; second, the open window at the Federal Reserve where those banks had access to 0 percent interest money. Now, they've been so successful that they have set aside this past year for their bonus pool \$150 billion.

They had three choices as to what they could do with that money: one, they could have added it to their balance sheets, strengthened it in order to basically fight another day so that if there was a downturn, they would be able to absorb it themselves and not come hat in hand to the taxpayer. Second, they could have lent it out. If you're getting 0 percent interest money from the Fed, you've got a local small business or a young family trying to buy their first home and you lend it out at 5 or 6 percent, most people would say that's a pretty good return. They didn't do that.

The third thing that they could do—and unfortunately they did do—is decide to put that money in their pocket with a bonus. That's good for them, but it certainly hasn't been good for the American economy.

So our legislation, the Wall Street Bonus Act, is very simple. It says that all those bonuses on Wall Street that went to banks that received taxpayer assistance through the TARP program, those bonuses above \$50,000 would be taxed at 50 percent. And every single dollar that was collected would then be made available to the Small Business Administration to work with our local banks that have been making loans to lend to our job-creating small businesses around the country. So we would be taking a dividend for and on behalf of the taxpayers who basically put that money up in the first place, and we would be specifically making that money available for lending with a partnership of the SBA and our small banks.

Now, this is important for a couple of reasons: number one, the money that was made on Wall Street, that \$150 billion bonus pool, yes, it was smart people buying and selling and trading derivatives, but the question for us is, when we put taxpayer dollars to work, is it good for the American taxpayer? Is it good for the Main Street economy? And, obviously, if it just goes into the pockets of the Wall Street traders, it does a lot of good for them, but no good for our broad economy; and our fundamental responsibility is to help people get back to work.

The second is that the bonus culture really is very destructive because what it encourages is placing a big bet, bet red, bet black, if you win, you make a lot of money, if you lose, as we've seen, the banks can come to the taxpayer and get bailed out. And people are furious about that, rightly so. So it is time for us to make a basic statement here that will reward investment, will reward hard work, but we're not going to have the taxpayers be on the hook for people who want to gamble.

The final thing really is this: we face a question about what business model we want America to follow. Do we want a business model where you make money by financial engineering, by having the quickest computer trading program, by a lucky bet on a speculation? Or do we want a business model

where folks make their money by showing up for work, by investing in their community, by hard work for the long term, by being satisfied with a steady and sustainable rate of return and profit—which we need in a capitalist economy—by treating their workers right and by paying our fair share? That's the question.

The Populist Caucus is very strongly united in the view that hard work should be rewarded, that entrepreneurs, job creators, people who make money because they invest in their economy, because they invest in their workers, that is to be rewarded and encouraged. In fact, we have to do it if we're going to have an economy that works and expands rather than an economy that is based on flipping trades, about speculation, and financial engineering.

So this Wall Street Bonus Act would put some money into lending and help our small entrepreneurs. And I am very grateful that we have the strong support of so many Members of Congress for this.

I yield back.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Well, I thank you for those very insightful comments.

I think everything that we talked about earlier on why we formed the Populist Caucus, to promote and expand the middle class by emphasizing economic principles, that will create policies that help that to happen. We know that small businesses make up a huge part of the middle class. We also know that they are a huge driving engine for creating new jobs in our economy.

That is why I am happy to recognize my good friend from Florida, RON KLEIN, who has been a strong advocate for small businesses during his time in Congress and is going to be sharing with us some of the things that we can work on together to try to create the types of incentives that will help small businesses take the risk with sound economic principles and lead us on a path of job recovery.

With that, I would yield to my friend.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Well, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. And as always, it's great to be here with our friends from the Midwest and from the South. We represent the whole country, and it's such a great thing to be here, as we all got elected a couple of years ago and we have learned and listened very closely to what people are saying back home.

I know the gentleman from Wisconsin talked about jobs and sort of where we've come from, and I know the gentlelady from Ohio did the same thing. The "where we've come from" part didn't just start in the last 13, 14 months; unfortunately, it has been going on for a long time. A lot of that was decisions made in some cases by government, sort of incentivizing big decisions to send business overseas, encourage that through tax policy, and some of it has just been people making

decisions that we've lost that American ingenuity.

Well, we haven't lost it, we all know that. This is the greatest country in the history of the world and our economy is the strongest. And, yes, we are being challenged right now, but this is when we are at our best. And that's the exciting part. This is a moment for us all to come together, put our arms around each other and say, what's great about America? Our worth ethic, our ingenuity, our technology, our innovation, this is what makes it. But we have to recognize that some of these policies—certainly when this administration started, a mere 13 months ago, we were losing 720 jobs per month. That's incredible. Now we are in a place where fortunately it's moving in the right direction—I think it was 20,000 or 30,000 jobs per month. Now, that's not good, we want to gain, we want to be at 100,000-plus; but, boy, that is certainly moving in the right direction, and that is what I am glad to see.

□ 2115

Now, I come from a State, Florida, which had 15 years of incredible prosperity, a lot of growth. For the people in my community, their property values went up, and their businesses were expanding. All good. The American Dream was happening over and over and over again. Yet, when the banks stopped lending, as we've been talking about, well, guess what? The merry-go-round stopped, and a lot of people are hurting right now. They are hurting psychologically; they are hurting emotionally; they are hurting physically.

The worst thing, as I know the gentlelady from Ohio talks about, is not to have that job, not to have that ability as a provider, a man or woman of a household, to bring that paycheck home, to get up in the morning and know you're going to do something productive and to make that example for your children. We want to make sure that people have that opportunity, and that's what we are working toward right now.

Well, as to this "spur job creation" part of the Blueprint for Recovery, there are two points I want to bring up:

One is the "buy American" concept. It's real simple. Every opportunity, when it comes to sourcing goods, services, and things like that, needs to be done in the United States. If there is anything that we can certainly promote, it's our providing those goods and services—our local businesses. Your neighbor down the street, one you go to a church, to a synagogue, or to a supermarket with or one you coach Little League with is someone who works in the community. We want to give that businessperson and his or her employees or the people he works with an opportunity to be that source for government contracts and everything else—not to go overseas. We all understand the issue of free trade and all that, but free trade is fair trade, and

we want to make sure that, in this country, we are doing everything we can to promote our businesses first. It's real simple. I think most Americans get it. I think we've gotten a little off track over this thing, but that's a principle we need to pass and support and hold to.

Second—

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Absolutely.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I think there is a big misperception that our trading partners and our competitors in the global economy don't have any "buy Chinese" trade policies or "buy Japan" trade policies; is that true?

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Absolutely.

We all understand the real game here, and it's not just about what they call "tariffs." You may have heard of a "tariff." That's a tax. If you bring something into a country, there is a tax to make it less competitive. Well, there are a lot of other ways to stop our wonderful American goods from going to other countries. They have lots of obstacles. It goes on in the auto industry all the time with emissions and lots of things that just make it practically impossible for us to sell.

Now, we can't force someone in Korea to buy one of our cars, but we should give him that choice. If we have the best products, consumers will buy our products, just like some products come into this country, and consumers make a choice. Right now, there are a lot of things going on to stop our products from going to other countries.

Mr. KAGEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Sure.

Mr. KAGEN. In Wisconsin, we have got a number of companies which have run into problems with regard to "buy American." We have buy American clauses in our government contracts today. Yet Miller Electric Company, which makes the finest welding apparatus in the world, put in a bid for a shipbuilding company, a government contract for the Navy. This foreign-owned shipbuilding corporation down in the South decided, instead of buying American, they would use a loophole, and they bought something from a competitor from Germany.

Can you explain how this bill, this Buy American Improvement Act, would close the loopholes in these contracts?

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. That's exactly what it will do. I thank the gentleman for that example.

I have an example in my community, a company called Cross Match. It's a technology company. They make fingerprint equipment and things like that. They were bidding for a census contract, and a company that was sourcing it through a Korean company came in with all sorts of—not machinations—I would say, loopholes. This bill closes the loopholes, and I think that's exactly what we are all interested in.

The second thing I want to touch on, if I can, which the gentleman from

Iowa (Mr. BRALEY) just talked about, is something which, I think, we all understand—the lifeblood of our economy. That is access to capital, to bank loans—to small business loans.

One thing I can say about this Congress is that I am really proud of the efforts that have been brought about through this Congress to make SBA, Small Business Administration, loans much easier to get. At this point, they are 90 percent guaranteed by the government. If you are a qualified veteran, 95 percent is guaranteed. These are good quality loans, but these aren't loans that are made by the government. They are made by banks, and they are guaranteed by the government.

We need to get our banks to start focusing on making these loans and other commercial loans. We are not asking banks to make ridiculous loans like some of those that took place before which were not properly collateralized. Yet, for good, credit-worthy people, there are loads of small businesses that have long histories in our local communities. They know the loan officers at the banks, and they can work together and make loans happen.

One of the ideas being suggested is to take some of the payback money from some of the big banks that paid some of this money back and start bringing it down to the local level—to Main Street, to small banks, to community banks. We're not just talking about giving them the money like it happened before. Instead, it's an incentive to make the loans. If they make the loans, then they get discounts on the interest rates. This is what we have to do.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Absolutely.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. One of the things that is frustrating to many Americans is they just don't understand how their government can actually help stimulate economic development.

One of the best examples of this is, when I first came to Congress, I served on the Small Business Committee. I was fortunate enough to chair the Contracting and Technology Subcommittee, and this is when the previous administration was in control of the executive branch. As I talked to people on the committee, it shocked me to learn that the former administrator of the Small Business Administration saw it as his job to bring about the end of the Small Business Administration. Many of the policies were designed to contract the agency whose sole purpose was to try to stimulate small business growth and development.

So, when we are talking about how we create capital and provide economic incentives for small businesses, we have come a long way in 3 years to get to the point where this agency is trying to fulfill its basic purpose, and I think that is going to be critical for

achieving the types of results you've just talked about.

I hope you can enlighten us further on this.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I'll just conclude. There is so much more that everyone wants to say here, and there is so much to add. That's what's getting exciting about this work we're doing here.

Small businesses are the lifeblood of our economy. I mean many parts of our country do not have a lot of Fortune 500 companies. Those are great companies, and they add a lot of value to our country, but small businesses are going to be the businesses that get us out of this downturn, and we are beginning to see some good things. Bank lending is better than it was, but we need to encourage and find ways to make sure that the banks are lending so our small businesses can buy up some inventory, can buy up that capital equipment they need—a little deferred maintenance—and hire more people. That's the bottom line.

I just want to thank the gentleman for having this "spur job creation" because, I think, this is a huge part of how we are going to get our country back on track.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Well, I think one of the things we know is that, in order to spur job creation, you have got to be able to have revenues that will help people create jobs through incentives that will help them take that risk.

One of the important things that the Populist Caucus' Blueprint for Recovery does is it talks not only about how you change behavior through the policies you implement but also how you transfer some of the burden from Main Street, which has been suffering so much in this recession, to the very speculators whose wild gambling, which is what most economists call what they were doing, drove us over the cliff.

That is why one of the key elements of this "ending speculation" piece is one of the bills introduced by another vice Chair of the Populist Caucus, Congressman PETER DEFazio, who introduced his Let Wall Street Pay for the Restoration of Main Street Act. This is a very simple concept that existed in this country for almost 60 years, and it worked very successfully, including during the Great Depression.

What it says is that, if you are trading in excessive transactions on Wall Street, we are going to ask you to pay a small transaction fee on those high-volume trades so that we will have an incentive to keep you from engaging in excessive speculation that puts all of us at risk. His transaction fee is estimated to create somewhere between \$100 billion and \$150 billion in new revenues that can be used for two basic purposes:

One is job creation, which is what we all agree is going to create a huge emphasis for an economic recovery, because when people go back to work,

they not only pay Federal taxes and reduce our burden at the Federal Treasury; they pay State and local taxes, too, to help relieve the burden on our States and cities. This is how you create economic incentives to change corporate behavior from excessive speculation, and this is also how you provide new revenues to stimulate economic development and help to reduce the deficit.

I am going to ask one of our newest members and youngest members of the Populist Caucus, our good friend from Virginia, TOM PERRIELLO, to talk about the importance of having a bill like this to guide us in a new direction for economic recovery and what that means to the people in his district of Virginia.

With that, I'll yield to my good friend.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, thank you very much for that news and for the news from our friends in the house of lords—I mean the Senate—that has just come this way. It's very, very exciting because we, as a caucus, have been fighting so hard to shift the focus from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street. We understand that two out of every three new jobs in this country are coming from small business. Now, they may not make the headlines. It may mean you have lots and lots of small businesses, but that's the engine of our growth.

One thing we still do better than any other country in the world is innovate. We are better entrepreneurs. We are really good at this. It's within our small businesses that we see this innovation taking place, and we need to make sure that we are giving the kind of support that small businesses need, whether that's through direct lending, whether that's through the suspension of capital gains tax for small business to bring nontraditional lenders in, or whether that's providing the infrastructure and the workforce development that allows those small businesses to flourish. We also need to understand that the phrase "buy American" should not be seen as bad language.

I think it's timely that we look at this extension because, while there are many policies out there which may seem fancy, sometimes we have to get back to the basics. We are within weeks of the new building season's beginning, the spring building season leading into the summer building season. There are thousands of small businesses around this country that have held on and have taken losses for 2 years, whether it has been the construction firms, the engineering firms, the supply stores that have supplied those guys, or whether it has been the diners where folks have gone to eat. If we are not building anything in this country, we will not continue this path of recovery that we have worked so hard to lay out.

This is a chance, and we need to act here in Washington with the same ur-

gency that the previous Congress did when Wall Street was in trouble. Well, Main Street is in crisis, and we need to understand that we can rebuild this country. We may not see housing start to pick up this summer in the way that some would like, but we can rebuild our infrastructure, and we can reinvest in the existing building stock, whether that's municipal, commercial, or residential, through major retrofit programs.

It puts people to work in rebuilding America's competitive advantage, because what you understand, Mr. BRALEY, from your experience in Iowa and around this country is that we have to reinvent America's competitive advantage. We will outcompete the world, but we cannot do it solely through supporting the financial sector. We have to start building things, making things, and growing things again. We can still do that better than anyone in the world, but we need a trade policy, and we need a workforce development strategy. We need an economic development strategy that understands that those are things we can still do. There are sectors, like the energy sector, in which we can outcompete the world, but everyone else is not playing for second place. They are looking to do the same thing we are trying to do, but we can do it better.

This is our time. This recession right here, that we are starting to crawl out of, is an opportunity for us to reinvest, to rebuild that competitive advantage and to reemploy America in the work that so many in this room have worked so hard to do. There are families out there right now who are proud, hard-working people who are looking for jobs. We can work together across the aisle to make this happen, but we must have that commitment to basic commonsense things, like making sure we don't miss this summer's building season. We have that time, and we must have a deep sense of urgency because I know people out on Main Street do.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's comments about investing in infrastructure because most of what I learned about the need for infrastructure improvements came when I was working for the Poweshiek County Secondary Roads Department to help pay my way through college.

One of the things that I learned was that, as you try to create opportunities for transportation improvements that are going to move goods, services, and people, you see a lot of trickle-down that happens from the Federal Government, to the State government, to the county government, to the city government as right-of-ways are transferred after they are abandoned for bigger and better infrastructure improvements like four-lane highways.

□ 2130

One of the cornerstones of our blueprint for recovery that deals with job creation is a bill introduced by Con-

gresswoman ROSA DELAURO and co-sponsored by one of the vice chairs of the Populist Caucus, our friend from Minnesota, KEITH ELLISON, the National Infrastructure Development Bank Act.

What it does is it creates an opportunity to take advantage of existing infrastructure needs by identifying about 47,500 jobs and \$6.2 billion of potential economic activity that are currently ready, willing, and able to be acted upon, but because we have not had the opportunity to marry private development with public infrastructure projects, we are missing an opportunity to stimulate job growth through this National Infrastructure Bank.

So I would ask my colleagues who support investments in infrastructure improvements that cross the spectrum from expanding access to energy created by wind in the Midwest, by building out our ability to transfer that energy and electricity throughout the country, by building out our world broadband, by investing in roads, bridges, and public improvements, how this type of an investment development bank would make a difference in their districts.

I am going to yield to my friend from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Infrastructure creates such ripple effects in our economy and spurs economic development and opportunity for the people that we represent. Every time I go home, people beg, Please, please, invest in our Nation's infrastructure. We know that the need is tremendous.

One of the bills, in addition to the National Infrastructure Bank bill, which I think we should talk about more, but you mentioned Representative DEFazio's bill, the bill entitled Let Wall Street Pay for the Restoration of Main Street Act. I think this is also a bill that deals with infrastructure, because when we get the money from those transaction fees of those risky trades that are something that we would really like to have cut back on, we are going to use it to invest in infrastructure and all the good that goes with it.

But we also have in that bill, and I think it is important to tell people, that part of the revenue that would come in in addition to that huge amount going to invest in Main Street, you know, Main Street, after all, is who bailed out Wall Street, and we didn't do it because we were fans of their behavior. We did it so they would start lending. As we discussed, they didn't start lending, so we need to continue to push until things are right. But also in that bill, there is a part of the revenues raised that are going to go to deficit reduction. So we often hear this argument that it is all about the deficit.

Well, it is about jobs and the deficit. In order to get rid of the deficit, people do have to have jobs. Frankly, obviously people need to have jobs, because

this is the United States of America, and that is the American dream, having a job and raising your family and aspiring to a quality of life that is second to none across this country. So, in that bill, in addition to putting money into infrastructure, we also take a piece of that money and let Wall Street help to pay down some of the deficits that were created by helping Wall Street get out of the mess that they were in.

So, back to the other bill that you mentioned, which is critically important, and you asked how important it was back in Ohio, in my district. It just can't be overstated. Just yesterday, I received a whole list of infrastructure projects that are ready to go that need funding.

The thing about infrastructure is that we all know that it can't be ignored indefinitely, right? But oftentimes we come to a place where we don't address it until a crisis occurs. And that doesn't make any sense either. So if we can put people to work doing that work that we know has to be done and spur greater economic development and recovery, why wouldn't we do that?

This National Infrastructure Bank legislation is a critical component of taking the idea, the concept that we all know makes sense, and really maybe that is what the Populist Caucus represents more than anything; it is about the common sense. People know what we need to do for our country, to strengthen the middle class and put people to work rebuilding our infrastructure. Other countries are building their infrastructure. They are investing massively in their infrastructure, because they know the value that it creates beyond the jobs that are put forth just in doing the construction.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I think that is a great opportunity to talk about the importance, because when I served on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in the 110th Congress, our chairman, the legendary JIM OBERSTAR, always reminded us that our global competitors are investing massive amounts in infrastructure development.

The European Union had a 5-year, \$1 trillion infrastructure development plan. You look at China, which has just passed the United States as the leading consumer of automobiles, and you look at the ribbons of concrete that have been poured in that country to respond to growing consumer and commercial demand for transportation.

If we are competing with these people in a global market, Dr. KAGEN, we have to make similar types of commitments so that our infrastructure system can make us competitive. I know from visiting your district in northeast Wisconsin, it is a very spread out and remote area in some parts of your district, yet the constituents that you represent in those areas depend just as

much on an infrastructure system as the people here in our Nation's Capital.

I yield for your comments.

Mr. KAGEN. I thank you. I will just summarize what everyone here on the House floor understands. We are about \$2.1 trillion to \$2.2 trillion behind in our investment in our infrastructure, our roads, our bridges, our schools, our wastewater treatment plants. What good would it be if we generate several million jobs, even 10 million jobs, when we manufacture things and then we don't have the railroads or have the highways and the water infrastructure to transmit our goods to the world's marketplace? So we are indeed several trillion dollars behind in our infrastructure development.

I will just point out one of the facts about the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that few people realize. Apart from the fact that it was the largest tax cut in American history, little known is the fact that the transportation and infrastructure investment, which was only 4 percent of that amount of money we invested in America, generated 25 percent of the jobs.

Nearly 900,000 people are working because of that American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. It put people back to work in our infrastructure. And that multiplier is significant. For every person working in transportation, that money turns over many times over.

So let me just see if I get this straight, if I understand where we are going with our ideas about rewarding people or encouraging people with the taxation code.

If you are sitting in a boardroom on Wall Street and you are rewarding yourself for your failure with the taxpayers' money, according to the Populist Caucus, we would like to put a significant tax on that bonus and use that revenue and put it back into the American economy to generate small business activity through the SBA, put it back into people's hands.

We do believe that people are more important than profits. We should in fact reward work rather than wealth. If I understand the transfer tax on Wall Street speculators, it is one-quarter of one penny of each dollar being traded on nanosecond trades. This is not going to be a fee or a transfer tax placed on those who are speculating for the long-term investment. It is going to exclude any tax-favored retirement accounts, any HSA, Health Savings Account, any Education Savings Account, and would exclude the first \$100,000 of your income generated from your investment in America's future on our American exchanges.

Some people have pushed back against that Wall Street transfer fee by saying then people will trade overseas. In London, which is the most active trading floor in the world, they do have a transfer fee twice what we are suggesting.

So, again, the idea is we want to use the Tax Code to reward people for their

good activity. And, most especially, we want to use existing structures like our community banks, our credit unions, and regional banks to find the finances and credit necessary for small businesses once again to have access to the credit they need to generate the economic activity and generate the jobs.

Don't think for a minute that the Federal or State government can employ you and work our way through this recession with government-sponsored jobs. We can't do that. So it is the role of government to set up a system wherein you are rewarded for your work rather than your wealth. By focusing on our transportation and infrastructure needs, we can begin to generate millions and millions of jobs to do just that. We want people to stay in their own homes once again, rather than have this foreclosure crisis come back and bite us.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I appreciate those observations. I want to engage a couple of my colleagues in a conversation about behavior modification on Wall Street. I am going to start with my friend from Vermont, because he served on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in the last Congress when we had the hearing with the CEOs of AIG, trying to explain why they stood by and watched as their London financial services division drove this economy off a cliff by engaging in excess and speculative trading in high-risk credit default swaps and complex derivatives.

Now, one of the things we learned during that hearing from the economic experts who study those high-risk investments was that long before any of us came to Congress, Congress was confronted with the issue of how we provide some type of oversight of this highly complex and evolving marketplace, which at that time in the late 1990s was a small fraction of the \$100 trillion marketplace it has become.

But what was most shocking to me as they testified was when they said Congress was trying to decide what are these products. In a way, they are like an insurance product, because they are an agreement to pay upon a contingent future event. But they are really not insurance, because otherwise we could regulate them through the State insurance commissioners. Then they said, Well, these are kind of like stock trading, so we can have this regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission. But it is really not a stock transaction.

So, what is it? Well, about 10 percent of these products, those experts testified, if you remember, Mr. WELCH, were real insurance products. And these economists testified the other 90 percent were pure gambling, people trying to make money by turning over transactions, betting on the come that at some point when those commitments came due, they would be able to generate a profit without adding anything of value, other than risk and a possible payment in the future.

So, why is it necessary, when we are talking about ending excessive speculation, to get to the very core, not only of how you do that with a tax policy and with a transfer fee, but also how you deal with the financial oversight of the marketplace to make sure this never happens again?

Mr. WELCH. Well, I appreciate that. You know, really what it is about is whether banking is going to be an activity that is about lending money to businesses, small businesses, families, to buy their first home, or it is going to be a mechanism for financial speculation. And it is really two totally different models.

I want to just take up on what you were saying. We need a banking system. We need a strong banking system. We need local bankers who are actually engaged in their community, who can make judgments about who is good for a loan. I want to give you an example of the local bank and the Wall Street operation.

In St. Albans, Vermont, we have a small bank, People's Bank. The president of that bank, Rick Manahan, his desk is in the entry of the bank. If you walk in, you see all the teller windows. There is a big vestibule area, the public area. His desk is there. People do not have a hard time asking Rick what is going on. He knows the folks in his community.

His bank and his board of directors see a good day's work when, at the end of the day, they have been able to authorize a loan to a local business—it might be a retailer, it might be a construction company—knowing that that business is going to use that money to help create a local job. Or it is a young family getting started. They have to make a tough underwriting decision. But they know that family, and they know they are going to do their level best to be good for it. At the end of the day, a house has been sold, a family has got a new place to live, and they go home and sleep pretty good at night, knowing that they have made a real contribution in the community.

The other model, just to give you an example, one of our most esteemed Wall Street banks, is Goldman Sachs.

□ 2145

They have the best and brightest of folks doing the work there. But here's one of the things that they did—and it was very successful for them making money. They bought a mortgage origination company in the South. They hired 26, 30-year-old young people to go out, knock on doors, and sell mortgages. Generally, subprime mortgages that people couldn't afford and didn't need. They then brought those mortgages back to New York, and they bundled them into products that they then sold.

But before they sold them, they got the best and brightest MBAs to knock on the doors of the rating agencies and persuade the rating agencies that these toxic instruments were AAA. Then

they went to their sales department and had them contact trusted investors, pension funds, and said, We've got some AAA products here. You ought to buy them. It's going to be a good return for your pensioners. And they sold them. Then they went to their trading room and they said, You know what? These are junk. How do we know? We sold them. And they bet short against the instruments they'd just sold long.

That would not happen at People's Trust in St. Albans, Vermont. They couldn't even imagine doing that, selling something that wasn't worth investing in. They couldn't do it. And I know that every single one of us, Republican and Democrat, have local bankers who've met that standard, where the goal is to serve the community. And they know that their responsibility with this trust that they have of depositor money is to put it to good work to build the economy.

Wall Street has a different point of view. Not that they're not necessary; they obviously are. But when they are helpful, they see that the work that they do should be in service of the work that Main Street does. You know, that's why with the reforms that we must implement, whether it's a bonus tax, whether it's a Consumer Product Safety Commission, whether it's tightening up on the lending regulations and derivative trading, all of that, the bottom line is really very simple: Is the banking system going to be there to serve us, or are we going to be there to serve the financial engineering of the banking system? That's the question that this Congress faces and America wants an answer to. I yield back.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for your comments. We are just about out of time so I'm going to ask my friend from Florida for some closing comments, especially on this critical issue that affects the middle class homeowners, and that's the mortgage foreclosure crisis.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I want to thank the gentleman. Just sort of as an add-on to what we're talking about, we all know that homeownership in the United States is crucial. It's crucial for people knowing where to plant their investment. They're working hard over the years to make sure they have a place to live, and hopefully it will increase in appreciation. But that same description that Mr. WELCH just gave us about banking practices, in some cases resulted in, unfortunately, a whole lot of people getting in way over their heads, a whole lot of lending that shouldn't have never been lent in the first place, and the foreclosure situation is really bad in many places.

I witnessed something over the weekend in West Palm Beach. In the West Palm Beach Convention Center a group came into town and said, We are going to bring together the lenders who, in many cases, have not been answering the phone, the line is busy or people haven't been getting answers, along

with people that are having these real big problems, they can't make their mortgage payments. It's not like they're totally out of it. They may have had a job that was earning \$50,000 a year, and they lost it, and now they're earning \$35,000. Or, maybe a two-income household that they want to stay there. And we, as Americans, want them to stay there, if they can. We don't want abandoned houses. It just puts more pressure on the local streets and the local community.

At this event over the weekend—it was running for 5 days, 24 hours a day—and all the major lenders were there, except for one. It was really interesting; 5,500 people were in this building at one time. I'd never seen anything like this. And they had the lenders sitting across the table, here to here, and they were actually ironing out one after another. One guy had an 11 percent mortgage. It was reduced to 5½ percent. His payment went from \$2,100 to \$1,300. And I asked him, Can you make do? He said, Yes. I'm keeping my house. I'm sleeping tonight. My children know they have a place, a roof over their head tonight.

Well, this has been frustrating, but help is on the way. Help is on the way. And I think that the model has now been created. It's working in different parts of the country. But I'm really gratified to see that some people in south Florida were given that opportunity. There's a lot more to work through in all of our communities, but I'm starting to see some success, and that's part of how our recovery is going to happen, by putting the necessary pressure for people to get together and make this work.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. And that's why the Blueprint for Recovery we've been talking about that the Populist Caucus has put forward—real solutions, concrete solutions, that are going to help us get out of this mess, by ending excessive speculation on Wall Street, making sure that we have a fair compensation system for the people who have gotten us into this mess, and spurring job creation with things like the Wall Street Bonus Tax Act, the National Infrastructure Development Act, the Make Wall Street Pay for the Restoration of Main Street Act, and the Buy American Improvement Act.

These four commonsense bills will make an enormous impact on the quality of life for middle class families. They also represent true populist policies that are about building America up, not tearing it down. It's about giving voice to the legitimate concerns of the American people who made this country great.

With that, I thank my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of our time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4691. An act to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEINRICH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege and an honor to be recognized by you to address you on the floor of the House of Representatives. Having watched the collection of colleagues from the other side of the aisle over the last 60 minutes, a lot of subjects were brought up and I think delivered in a professional fashion by my colleagues, and I hope they know I'm always open to dialogue if they have some things that they would like to exchange with me. I'm here. And I have often asked my colleagues to yield, and if they should ask me to yield, I'm happy to do so. I think it's important to have an exchange, a dialogue.

First, we learned last Thursday that Republicans have a lot of good ideas. We also learned that many of those good ideas are suppressed by the iron-fisted gavel of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Also, as I looked at the event as it unfolded, Mr. Speaker, that 6½ hours of discussion that took place last February 25, last Thursday, at Blair House, on health care, a number of things came to me, but looking at the data was quite interesting. Just to boil it down to raw numbers and regular comparison, it was this: that for every 2 minutes that a Republican spoke, the President spoke for an additional 2 minutes and another Democrat spoke for another 2 minutes. So it was really two-to-one in the time that was used. As the President said, well, it's okay if he talks a long time, even though the time was very limited to the others that were talking because, after all, he is the President. So the time doesn't charge against him. It's an interesting concept that I think that heretofore has not been uttered by the President of the United States and in any previous administration.

Another thing that struck me that appears to have not been mentioned by the pundits or the people that observed this were the number of times that the President interrupted those who were speaking. Now, I can identify with what this is like. I have a number of times in my legislative life run into the situation where there's a limited amount of time to speak and maybe the clock has 1 minute on it, 2 minutes, or 5 minutes, or, as it does right now tonight, it's got 60 minutes on it. So you watch the clock and you try to pack as much information into that period of time as you can. When something happens to break that up and

change the rhythm and shorten the time that you have, you have to adjust your message to compress it down into the time that you have left.

I believe that the clock that was set for the Members of Congress to speak was set at 3½ minutes. I don't know that. I believe that. I was thinking of the moment that the Republican leader in the Senate, Senator MCCONNELL, introduced Senator COBURN for his 3½ minutes to speak. I do remember the log on the time. It's pretty close to this. Senator COBURN spoke for a minute and fourteen seconds. He was interrupted by the President of the United States for something like 4 minutes and 20 seconds. And then he came back and he spoke again for a little bit more than a minute and he was re-interrupted again by the President of the United States. That happened about one more time in that iteration. The time then that was left for Senator COBURN had expired. And it was the thought and the concept that was driven by Senator COBURN was completely split and delayed because the President interrupted and burned up the time. And even though they may have reset the stopwatch on Senator COBURN's time, it isn't the same as having 3 uninterrupted minutes.

The President claimed more than that on many occasions throughout the entire day, to where it came down to this: the President spoke as much as either Republicans or Democrats, altogether, and he interrupted Members of the House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats, without reservation. Apparently, he believes he's the President of the United States and he can do that. That may be true on certain occasions and to a limit. But there is a limit, Mr. Speaker. And the limit was this: the President of the United States interrupted those who were there to be heard 70 times, 70 in 6½ hours; a little more than 10 times an hour. And of all those interruptions, he interrupted Democrats 20 times, Republicans 50 times. Fifty interruptions. And the kind of way that it breaks up the rhythm and the flow of the message that's being delivered and the fashion that I've talked about with Senator COBURN whom, I have not had this discussion with, by the way. For all I know, he has no objection to the process that was there. But for me, I do, Mr. Speaker.

So it was not possible for a consistent, continual flow of cogent thought to flow through with the President interrupted on 70 different occasions over the course of 6½ hours. It's hard to get to the bottom of something; it's hard to make your point when you're continually interrupted.

But I listened to this last hour, and I think the gentlemen had an opportunity to make their case. And there were plenty of them. I don't know that anything was particularly stunning, except I looked at the gentleman from Wisconsin's poster that was on this easel just a few minutes ago. It showed

the jobs that were either created or lost, not by the President of the United States, President Obama, or President Bush, but the jobs that were created or lost during their administration, which is a far more accurate way to discuss it. That span was over about a 2-year period of time.

It would have been hard to see the poster and understand it. I had to walk up very closely and analyze it, but it flowed back through 2009 and through 2008, into December of 2007. The curious thing about that chart, which showed an upside down parabolic curve of the bar graphs of jobs lost on under those two administrations, appeared to be about equal—the last year of the Bush administration, the first year of the Obama administration.

The curious part was that on the chart there was only one month where there were actually jobs that increased. That was during the Bush administration. And we all know that if you would take that month and then you would go back into 2008 and on into 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, all the Bush years, one would see that there was some up months and some down months. And an administration needs to be looked at on balance. But here is what happened. These are the real viewpoints on what happened with our economy. It seems to be ignored.

Now the gentleman that stood at this particular podium had on his chart that under the Bush administration we had two wars, two tax cuts, one drug entitlement, and an asterisk for the Wall Street bailout. Well, okay. First, I will bring us up to these two wars, Mr. Speaker, and I can do it fairly briefly, and that is this: when President Bush was elected in the year 2000, after we went through all of the recounts in Florida and the Supreme Court decision and the allegations that the President was an appointed President, not an elected President, which no recount or analysis would support, all of the reviews of the elections in Florida and everywhere else in the year 2000 support that George Bush won that election. It's too bad it was so close. It was too bad we had to have such a fight. It's too bad it had to go to the Supreme Court. But in the end no one has made a legitimate case that there was anything other than a legitimate election, and every State, including Florida, in a count that was 527 or 537—I think 537—was the difference in Florida. Very, very close. And it wasn't so close, of course, in 2004.

But in the year 2000, when George Bush was elected President, already we had seen the bursting of the dot.com bubble. Now this was this false sector of the economy that was created because the investors in America and around the world saw that we had developed the microchip. And with the microchip we had developed the ability to store and transfer information more effectively, more efficiently, and more quickly than ever before and more cheaply than ever before.

So the investors began to bet on the dot.com companies. As they invested in the dot.com companies, there were companies out there that had capital that they could utilize. And they invested it into the new industry that was growing. It was the information age. The information revolution. As that grew, it outgrew its ability of the technology we were developing, it outgrew its ability to produce a good or a service that could improve our productivity or efficiency.

□ 2200

So when that happened, it created a bubble. It was the investors' bubble created on the speculation that there would be a value that was inherent in our ability to store or transfer information better than ever before. There's more to be said about that, Mr. Speaker, but that was a description of the bubble.

The bubble was bursting at the end of the Clinton administration. That bubble was going to burst because the markets had to adjust to the irrational exuberance of the investment in the dot-com bubble. So as that bubble was bursting and George Bush was becoming President, we saw a decline in our economy. Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Fed, saw the bursting of the dot-com bubble and concluded that something needed to be done to shore that up, to fill that hole that was created in our economy because the bubble was collapsing and shrinking. And to fill the hole, Alan Greenspan decided, with or without the support of President Bush, that we should create a housing market that would help shore this up. So we ended up with unnaturally low interest rates. While that was going on, it played into the hands of the people that were driving for lower underwriting standards, lower standards of capital. And this was contributing to, later on, the mortgage crisis that we saw unfold about a year and a half ago.

That builds us up to September 11, 2009, where I see on the gentleman from Wisconsin's chart where he said two wars. Well, we had a dot-com bubble that was bursting. We had a Chairman of the Fed and others who had decided to shore up the hole created by the bursting of the dot-com bubble. Which, by the way, that bubble was pierced by the lawsuit against Microsoft. The bubble was growing. It was big. It was fragile. It was going to burst, I believe, but the bubble was pierced by the lawsuit against Microsoft that was brought about by a collection of State attorneys general who decided to file a class action lawsuit and took Microsoft to task and took them to court, and it cost millions and millions of dollars. That accelerated the collapse of the dot-com bubble. And as that accelerated and it went down, something needed to fill that void or we would have seen a serious economic decline and a real recession.

Well, we saw an economic decline. Some would argue—and honestly, if

look at the numbers, it technically probably was not a recession. But to fill the hole, the effort was made to create a housing bubble to fill the void that was created by the collapse of the dot-com bubble. That's what was taking place when George Bush was being inaugurated as President of the United States. He kept Alan Greenspan on, and I don't object to that, Mr. Speaker. I just make that as a point.

So as these two things are happening, the bubble was deflating. The dot-com bubble was deflating. The housing bubble was being created to fill the hole. While this was going on, along came the September 11 attack on the United States of America, the attack on what may have been this Capitol building or the White House. I think it would have been on the Capitol building. That's the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania. The attack on the Pentagon, where we lost our brave service personnel there, and the attack on the Twin Towers in New York, which causes us all to stop in reverent grief at the price that was paid by innocent Americans at the hands of the evil al Qaeda.

But, Mr. Speaker, that happened on President Bush's watch. I don't know that one could point to any act of omission or commission that contributed to that on the part of the administration. It happened. They found a vulnerability that had always existed, and al Qaeda exploited it. So we ended up at war. As the gentleman from Wisconsin's chart says, we were involved in two wars. We went immediately into Afghanistan. We drove al Qaeda out of Afghanistan and teamed up with the Northern Alliance, and with a very minimal number of troops in U.S. uniform, liberated the country of Afghanistan and eradicated Afghanistan of al Qaeda terrorists, these al Qaeda terrorists who needed some kind of habitat if they're going to operate. It was a just thing to do. It was a decision that had to be made early. It went very well, with a minimum number of American casualties, and Afghanistan was freed and liberated.

Then, because of intelligence worldwide, I found no one who disagreed with, because of a decision that was made, we went into Iraq. And not to deliberate on that, Mr. Speaker, and not to, let's say, kick that dead horse, but once we put our troops into action and asked them to put their lives on the line for us, for our liberty and for our freedom and for the destiny of America and the free world, it is our obligation to stand with them. And I have stood with our troops—not just our troops but also their mission—continually since the beginning of these operations as I came to this Congress and watched as the liberation of Iraq unfolded before our eyes on television.

So the poster that was here on this easel that said, well, under George Bush we lost all these jobs—well, the chart only shows the last year of the Bush administration—and we were

under two wars, and that we had had two sets of tax cuts and a drug entitlement and a Wall Street bailout. All of that blamed on George Bush.

Well, I would like to think they could get over this and quit revising history, as a matter of fact. Yes, we have two wars. Which one would they have avoided? Would they have avoided them both? Would anybody say we should not have gone into Afghanistan? Would you have just walked away and shrugged your shoulders and pointed your finger and said, This is a job for the Attorney General? After all, it must be a law enforcement operation. Surely there couldn't be a war against people that would annihilate the lives of 3,000 or more Americans on a single day. The worst attack on American homeland in the history of our country, and I see it listed here on the poster as if it were something we should not have been engaged in.

Mr. Speaker, it was nearly unanimous here in the House of Representatives to grant the authority for the President of the United States to engage in these operations. There was only one exception, so that's the only person that would get to come here to the floor and say, I told the you so. She'd be wrong. But there's only one person that has the credentials to even make that statement in this entire Congress. It's not the people that were down here tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, two wars. The war in Afghanistan was necessary and unavoidable. The war in Iraq was a decision that was made off of the intelligence that we had, and that is a separate debate. But we engaged in those operations, and once we did, I throw my lot with our troops and their mission, and I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that you can separate the two. And I think it's hypocritical to state that you are for the troops and opposed to the mission because you find yourself in a position where you're arguing that you support the troops but you're asking them to put their lives on the line for a mission that you do not agree with. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a line of dichotomy and hypocrisy that I cannot abide. So, yes, two wars. We know the reasons for each of them.

And another little bullet point on this poster that was here from the gentleman from Wisconsin is tax cuts, two tax cuts. Yes, we had them. We had an economy that needed some help. I'm not a great fan of the rebate that took place in 2001. I think it gives the economy just a little sugar high, and then it goes on the way it was. But I am a fan of the tax cuts that unfolded in 2003 that were signed into law by President Bush on May 28, 2003. Those were real tax cuts. Those were real economic stimulation tax cuts. They were the tax cuts that caused people to free up capital and reinvest it again and get this economy rolling again. Any data you look at supports that those tax cuts—those cuts in capital gains, those cuts in dividends, those cuts that let

people invest money and with some confidence believe it was going to improve their return on investment—were smart, and they were prudent, and they were useful, and they worked. It is a far, far better thing to stimulate our economy with tax cuts than it is to try to stimulate our economy with debt, as this current administration is seeking to do.

□ 2210

So the Bush administration had two series of tax cuts: 2001, which was essentially a rebate—they realized it didn't work; by 2003, they came back and asked for real stimulation tax cuts. We provided those in 2003, and they did work by any measure.

So when we look at the Bush administration, that little chart that shows only the last year of the Bush administration is not indicative of the Bush administration. Look at it on the balance. I don't have those numbers in my head. I just saw the chart. But that chart is indicative of the Obama administration. That is all we have to measure. We are in March, so we have 13 months of the Obama administration. There has been negative job growth every single month during the Obama administration. Now I'm not laying that all at his feet. He inherited a situation. The cycles of the global economy are part of this. The decisions that were made in this Congress is part of this. President Bush is not wholly to blame, if he is to blame at all. But what I saw happen was the recently admonished CHARLIE RANGEL, now chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, was the anticipated chairman of the Ways and Means Committee immediately in the aftermath of the Democrat takeover of the majority of the United States House of Representatives when NANCY PELOSI became Speaker. And CHARLIE RANGEL, the ranking member as I recall on the Ways and Means Committee, went on the national talk shows and he went over and over again. He went everywhere all the time. He talked about as much on the national talk shows as Newt Gingrich did when he became Speaker-elect of the House of Representatives.

And all of America watched and listened to CHARLIE RANGEL because they wanted to know. And the question was continually asked: Mr. RANGEL, which of these Bush tax cuts would you keep and which would you want to get rid of. And I don't recall a single straight answer, but I remember by November and December and January and part of February had rolled around, it had become clear to the analysts and pundits in America there was not one single tax cut of the Bush administration that CHARLIE RANGEL wanted to keep, not one.

From that period of time in November of 2006 until December of 2006, January and February of 2007, we saw industrial investment in America drop like a rock. Mr. Speaker, it did so be-

cause capital is smart. Capital is intelligent. It will do the wise thing. When capital investment realized that the costs of investment were going to get higher and higher, then it backed away from the marketplace and slowed down dramatically in industrial investment. That industrial investment that was lacking was the precursor to this economy that we are in today. Now it is not the only factor. There are a whole series of factors. People on this side of the aisle can make their arguments, and people on this side of the aisle can make their arguments, too.

But I have laid out the scenario where there is a bursting of the dot-com bubble, accelerated by the lawsuit against Microsoft organized by some of the State attorneys general that started our economy down a decline, and the chairman of the Fed, Alan Greenspan, made a decision I believe to try to prop it up by creating a housing market to help bring this economy back up again with unnaturally low interest rates and favorable terms and lower underwriting requirements, and that I believe was a precursor to the subprime mortgage crisis that brought about this economic decline, all of the while while this was going on, we saw the majority change in the House, and then the CHARLIE RANGEL position of not being committed to preserving a single Bush tax cut. And the result was capital left investment out of the industrial side of this marketplace. It slowed down our industrial production.

Mr. Speaker, there is a person in the gallery that is making gestures up there that are inappropriate. I would like to ask him to be removed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KING of Iowa. I request that he be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa will suspend. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your attention to the decorum in the Chamber. I do revere this institution that we all are a part of. And to pick up where I left off if I may, there is a flow to this economy that is impossible to discern with the definitive analysis on how much of it belongs on this side of the aisle and how much belongs on this side of the aisle, and how much of it is the organism that is the free enterprise economy we have, coupled with the politics that churn back and forth.

So we make our arguments. We make them in the media, and when we go home to our districts, we trust that the American people will sort this out and that they will then come to a decision that will elect the people that come back to this Congress in the next cycle of our elections and be able to make even better decisions than in the past.

So when the argument here is that even though the people in this Chamber and those who happen to be watching on C-SPAN have seen these bullets, the bullet points, to make it clear, on the chart of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is a friend and who I actually have a good personal relationship with, two wars—this side will argue that they were both necessary, and on this side they will argue only one was necessary. And the tax cuts; I have argued that one was only a sugar high and the other one was very effective and necessary. Apparently the people on this side of the aisle will argue that neither one of them was effective and necessary and we should follow the Keynesian approach.

The drug entitlement language—as I recall, there were a number of Democrats who voted for that bill, and the argument was, would you actually set up a Medicare proposal that would not include prescription drugs today, as much as prescription drugs are involved in providing health care to everybody in America. You wouldn't imagine that the pharmaceuticals that are so much a part of the stability for our health care would not be part of Medicare. So that argument, I think, stands pretty clear.

Then we have the other bullet point that was on the chart, Wall Street bailouts. Well, I was not a fan of Wall Street bailouts, Mr. Speaker. I, among about half of the Republicans, voted “no” on the \$700 billion TARP legislation which, by the way, was only \$350 billion worth of TARP legislation, only \$350 billion, and that is a relative term, when you are looking at \$750 billion, you can say that. But this \$750 billion TARP proposal that came from the Secretary of Treasury, Henry Paulson, his request was for immediately \$750 billion with no strings attached and he would spend the money as he saw fit, and he was the only one who could save our economy from going into a downward spiral and the global collateral and global currency from crashing.

Well, this Congress pulled it back, held it to \$350 billion. I voted “no” on each component of that because I believed that there wasn't any entity in this country that was too big to be allowed to fail, that we should simply let them fail because if we do so, it would remove the implication, the inference that the Federal Government was going to provide a guarantee. And if they believe it is implicit that the Federal Government will bail out companies that are too big to fail, then they take greater and greater risks and the markets don't work any more because they are propped up by the government.

So Wall Street bailout, I stand here, Mr. Speaker, and about half of my Republican colleagues stood with me each time opposed to the \$750 billion TARP fund bailout.

□ 2220

And maybe about the same number of Democrats stood in opposition and

in favor of it. So it was both parties, in roughly equal numbers—although not precisely—that supported the Wall Street bailout.

But, Mr. Speaker, then-Senator Obama—and now President Obama—did support the TARP bailout. He was in support of the \$700 billion. And when it came back, as the vote of \$350 billion now and \$350 billion to be requested by the next administration and approved by the next Congress, President Obama—then-Senator Obama—voted for that legislation; he was in favor of it.

When they went to the White House, JOHN MCCAIN and Senator Obama, to sit down with Speaker PELOSI and MITCH MCCONNELL, the leader in the United States Senate, and ROY BLUNT was there as well—and the list of people on the House side goes on—at that table, then-candidate Obama, Senator Obama was in agreement with the request for \$700 billion and voted for it. So it doesn't work very well for a Democrat to come to the floor of the House and point his finger at George Bush when he can clearly see that his President—and, by the way, my President—was in support of TARP. I was not. I stood in opposition to TARP.

The Wall Street bailout was approved by then-Senator Obama, the first half at \$350 billion, and then later on the other \$350 billion that was requested by the President to be elected later, which was President Obama, and approved by the Congress to be elected later, which was the Pelosi-Reid Congress, sent Henry Paulson another \$350 billion to go to the new Secretary of the Treasury. That Secretary, by the way, had tax troubles of his own.

So we can spin this a lot of ways, but what happened was at the end of the Bush administration and the beginning of the Obama administration and with the cooperation, support and assent of then-Senator and later on President-elect and then President Obama, here's what we saw happen. We saw that TARP funding approved in late September, early October of 2008 with the support of Obama and McCain and President Bush—not mine. We saw three large investment banks begin to be nationalized as the flow of this election came through. We saw the huge insurance company, AIG, nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. We saw Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac nationalized, taken over by the Federal Government. And then, pretty soon we saw General Motors and Chrysler nationalized and taken over by the Federal Government.

We saw the bankruptcy court accept the deal that was proposed by the Obama White House without one jot or tittle amended no matter what the testimony was before the bankruptcy court. A proposed package that was endorsed by—and for all I know shaped by—the White House to put these car companies through bankruptcy was, verbatim, approved by the bankruptcy court. Now, what a curious thing that

the White House can write a prescription for a bankruptcy and a takeover of private sector companies, two proud American companies, and the bankruptcy court couldn't find a single flaw in that proposal, no matter what the testimony to end back up with exactly the language of the agreement that was proposed by the White House, and which, by the way, was supported by Speaker PELOSI. And the language that she used was: I am not going to allow the automakers to get bargaining leverage over the unions.

And so the secured creditors and the car companies lost their investment completely—lock, stock and barrel, wiped out, Mr. Speaker. And shares of stock were handed over to the United Auto Workers Union. How could that happen in a Nation that believes in the rule of law? How could that happen in a Nation that allows for collateral to be held for secured creditors? The people that held the collateral for those companies lost their collateral, and part of the reason was because the large investment banks that had been invested in those shares had also received a bailout from TARP—the Troubled Asset Relief Program in case there is anybody that needs to know that.

When that happened, then it was leveraged against these large investment banks to capitulate, give up their secured interest in that collateral for General Motors and Chrysler so that it could be transferred over to the unions, whose concession was they conceded claims, insurance claims in the future. That's it. No real-time, now transfer of anything; simply some concessions down the line that looked like—if they're able to pass socialized medicine will be irrelevant anyway.

That's what I saw happen. TARP, the Troubled Asset Relief Program, \$350 billion under Bush, \$350 billion under Obama, three large investment banks nationalized, AIG, the insurance company, nationalized, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, one of them lost \$16 billion in the last quarter, \$16 billion, Mr. Speaker, all of that out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

The taxpayers are on the hook to ensure that these now wholly owned government entities, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, whose liabilities have been accepted by executive order of President Obama last December in the amount of contingent liabilities of \$5.5 trillion, and still the taxpayers continue to go to work every day and send their money into the Federal Government, and still this Federal Government's heart is hardened and can't seem to come to grips with the massive responsibility that they have accepted and transferred over onto the people of America.

And while all of this is going on, the Community Reinvestment Act, which was passed in the late seventies, “modernized” in the early nineties under Bill Clinton, that Community Reinvestment Act that was designed to put an end to redlining around districts in

our inner cities—mostly inner cities, wouldn't have had to be exclusively that, Mr. Speaker—and it was an activity that I disagree with and object to, but there were lenders that could see that there were neighborhoods where the asset values were going down, inner city neighborhoods. Any of the inner city properties where the asset value was going down, they took, more or less, a red pen and drew a line around those areas in the inner city whose asset values were going down, they were redlining them. They would draw a boundary around them and then make a decision that they were not going to loan any money into that area because the collateral value was diminishing rather than appreciating.

So when that happened, and it became apparent here in this Congress, the hearts of the Members of Congress went out to the people that were trying to make a living and live in those areas and passed the Community Reinvestment Act, which essentially said if you're going to make loans and if you're going to expand your operations with branches or continue to go into other neighborhoods, then you need to comply with the Community Reinvestment Act, which means, in short, that lending institutions had to make bad loans in bad neighborhoods. That's the short version of what it is. There are a lot of nicer ways to say it, but that is the blunt version, Mr. Speaker.

So these lending institutions were having trouble defining what that meant. Well, ACORN was there to help them. They were there to shake down these lenders and push the lenders into making more bad loans in bad neighborhoods. But the problem was that the lenders couldn't make any more loans because they were having trouble selling these mortgages off into the secondary market, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, because the underwriting requirements for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were not loose enough to allow those mortgages to be sold into the Fannie and Freddie secondary loan market.

And so this wonderful organization called ACORN came to this Congress in the early nineties and lobbied the Congress—they weren't the only ones, but they were a very, very active and forceful organization—they lobbied the Congress to lower the underwriting and the collateral of down payment standards for the borrowers so that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac could buy up these loans on the secondary market. And the loans that would be made by the lending institutions that were seeking to comply with the Community Reinvestment Act, make those loans, bad loans in bad neighborhoods, sell them off to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, shed themselves of it, take their profit and their margins out and let Fannie and Freddie worry about that as they rolled them forward. All of that was going on, and it wasn't going fast enough.

But once the underwriting requirements for Fannie and Freddie were approved here in this Congress in the early nineties, then ACORN went to work and accelerated their effort to promote more and more bad loans in bad neighborhoods. While that was going on, the shakedown was being accelerated. But it wasn't enough to have a, let me say, lobbying operation here in Washington that was pushing to lower the standards for Fannie and Freddie, but there was an activist shakedown operation going on out there in the neighborhoods where ACORN's people were proudly saying that they went into lending institutions and they would shove the banker's desk over against the wall and all surround the lender and chant and scream at him to intimidate him into making more and more bad loans in bad neighborhoods.

□ 2230

So what did they do?

In an attempt to please or placate, the lenders made more bad loans in more bad neighborhoods. Then ACORN found themselves in a position where they could actually score the lenders as to whether they were in compliance with the Community Reinvestment Act.

Well, think about what that means—an outside organization that emerges today as a criminal enterprise, scoring lending institutions as to whether they're in compliance with the very vague language of the Community Reinvestment Act, and encouraging more and more bad loans in bad neighborhoods. Alan Greenspan is up there, lowering interest rates, extending the terms, lowering the standards for a downpayment. All of this accelerated bad loans in bad neighborhoods. Subprime mortgages made that all happen, and you had this snowball that was rolling along underneath the radar.

We saw this start to break apart a year and a half or so ago, Mr. Speaker. That's when Henry Paulson came to this Capitol and did his Chicken Little routine.

He said, The financial sky is falling, and I can prop it up with \$700 billion.

What's your guarantee?

He said, I have no guarantee, but it's the only thing that has any chance of working. You'll have to give me the money, and I'll do what I can with it.

That's the picture of what happened: The Community Reinvestment Act, the shakedown of lenders, ACORN engaged in the middle of this, ACORN finding themselves as the broker for bad loans and the approver of the lending institutions that are making enough bad loans that it meets their standard. That's what we saw happen, and we saw this economy start to crack apart again. When it cracked apart and when the economy started to spiral downward, yes, that was under George Bush's watch, but it was also, Mr. Speaker, under NANCY PELOSI's watch, and it was under HARRY REID's watch.

I have stood here on this floor, have sat up in these seats and have listened to enough debate from this side of the aisle when, over and over again, Democrats in this Congress have said, Give us the gavels. We will make it better. We can fix this economy. We can grow this country. We will take care of our national defense. Everything will be right again. This is before President Obama was even elected to the United States Senate. There were declarations from this side of the aisle that you could fix everything if you could just get the gavels.

Well, you got the gavels. You got the gavels in 2006, and we saw industrial investments spiral downwards, and we saw the subprime mortgage crisis spiral even further downwards. By the way, in 2005, I stood on this floor and I supported raising the standards of underwriting for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, requiring them to have similar, not exactly the same, capital requirements as the other lending institutions and similar regulations of the other lending institutions.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, was that the now chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. FRANK, came to this floor and vigorously opposed an amendment that was offered by Mr. Leach of Iowa, on October 26, 2005, which would have fixed Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Jim Leach understood what we needed to do. I understood what we needed to do. There were several dozen others who understood what we needed to do. Yet the defender of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would later on become the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, and he would continue to defend Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and he would open up authorizations to fund ACORN and to accelerate the downward spiral of our economy.

I come to this floor tonight, and I hear it's all George Bush's fault. Well, as you may know, Mr. Speaker, I'm having a little trouble with this logic.

So I'll just fast-forward to another circumstance that took place yesterday and the day before and the day before and the day before and that will be taking place tomorrow. It is the position that Senator JIM BUNNING has taken with regard to the extension of unemployment benefits. He has taken the position that, if you really believe that we should pay as we go, then the people who are promoting that we should extend unemployment benefits should find a way to pay as we go. That's their pledge.

They passed PAYGO here. Of course it's a sham. They just simply bypass it, ignore it, or put a little language in the bill that says PAYGO doesn't apply, and they move on. They do whatever they want to do. There is no standard anymore. The integrity has diminished substantially.

JIM BUNNING said, Hold it. Before we extend unemployment benefits, find a way to pay for it.

This is an administration that has spent way out of proportion to any

other. This is in the trillions of dollars. We have a President who is a Keynesian economist, if he is an economist at all, and he is on steroids. He has a voracious appetite to spend our grandchildren's future incomes.

Today, by my numbers, a baby born in America owes Uncle Sam for the birthright of being a natural born American citizen \$44,000. Somebody else's number is \$46,000. I'll stick with \$44,000. It's a conservative number. By the time that child starts the fifth grade, if the President's budget is approved, authorized, and appropriated, we will see that child owing the Federal Government \$88,000 when he walks in to meet his fifth grade teacher. \$88,000.

At the same time, this same administration laments the college debt that they have. Now, if you have a student who walks out of college and who gets his degree with \$88,000 worth of debt, that seems to be more than he wants to bear. The hardest thing is to come short of a degree and still have the college debt because you don't have the sheepskin to help you with the revenue stream, and you've got to find another way to do it.

I will say that I empathize with those college students who have high debt, but I even greater empathize with those American babies who are born every day in this country with a huge debt over their heads that they had nothing to say about. They don't really have a means to take that and call it an investment and a return on that investment. It is unconscionable that we would put our children and grandchildren in debt in the fashion that we have, and it is trillions of dollars, Mr. Speaker. The numbers work out to be something like this:

We've had something like an \$11.3 trillion national debt. That national debt has now been raised to around \$14 trillion. If you look at the Obama budget, when you project it out over a 10-year period of time, that takes it up to \$28 trillion. Now, this is a massive burden that we have. How do we work our way out of it?

We are going the wrong way—raising up mandatory wages. Let's say we raise minimum wage a high percentage, 30-some percent or so. We have got a Davis-Bacon wage scale, the federally imposed union scale on every construction project in America that has 2,000 or more Federal dollars invested in it. It unnaturally inflates the cost of every project that has Federal dollars in it someplace between 8 and 35 percent. The most recent data shows an average of a 22 percent increase because of Davis-Bacon wage scales, which truly are union wage scales.

Then on top of that, while the Federal Government is managing minimum wage, managing imposing a union wage scale even on competitive contracts—and by the way, the Davis-Bacon wage scale is the last Jim Crow law in America. I know of no other Jim Crow law left in America. This is one.

It is the remaining Jim Crow law. It was designed to lock African Americans out of the trade unions in New York City back in 1932. There was a Federal building contract that was let in the Depression era, and a contractor from Alabama was the low bidder on the project. He brought a lot of African American workers in from Alabama up to New York City to build that Federal building. They'd work cheaper. They came in.

The unions got together and lobbied. Somebody said they were both Republicans, and if so, I don't identify with them at all. Two New York legislators—a senator and a representative—called Davis and Bacon decided that they were going to impose a prevailing wage on America, which turns out to be the union scale on America, which is an increase of 22 percent.

So the decision we have is: Do we want to build 4 miles of road or 5? Do we want to build four bridges or five? Do we want to build four schools or five? Do you want to build 4 miles of bike trail or 5? Name your project. Do you want to build four buildings or five? How many shovel-ready projects do you want to go to work if they are of equal value—four or five? That's the difference between the non-Davis-Bacon merit shop and Davis-Bacon wages.

I am confronted with the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, who has consistently made the argument with many of his colleagues over on this side of the aisle that the Federal Government has no business injecting themselves in between two consenting adults. The two consenting adults should be able to do whatever they want to do. It doesn't hurt anybody else. That's their argument. What business is it of ours in this Congress if two consenting adults want to carry on in any fashion whatsoever, whether we can discuss it here into the RECORD or whether we can't, Mr. Speaker?

Well, the same individuals who make that argument seem to think that the Federal Government should inject themselves into every transaction between two consenting adults, provided there are some 2,000 or more Federal dollars involved. So now we have Uncle Sam's telling David King what he has to pay his employees on a construction project in Iowa: If I want to go climb in his excavator on a project, and I say, Hey, Dave. I want to do this for nothing. I just enjoy doing this work. It takes me back to my roots, and I want to help this company, or if I say, Will you just pay me \$10 an hour? That'll make it work. It'll give me a little spending money and make it work.

□ 2240

He can't do it. It would be a violation of Federal law. I cannot enter into an agreement with my own son, two consenting adults, and work for \$10 an hour or \$20 an hour or nothing, because the Federal Government has decided they want to tell two consenting adults

what they can do, what they will be paid for work that is done.

By the way, it changes dramatically from district to district. You might go across the road, the center of the centerline of a highway, and find out there is a 20, 30, or 40 percent difference in this thing called prevailing wage, which actually is union scale.

The Federal Government is messing up the works. The free enterprise system has got to be allowed to operate and flourish. There needs to be a floor that is established under labor that is supply and demand. There needs to be a wage and benefits package that is reflective of supply and demand, and the skills of the employee. That, sadly, is not the case when the Federal Government is involved.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of distortions that have been taking place here, and our Keynesian economist on steroids who is in the Oval Office has further distorted this. We need to take this country back, back to our roots, back to our origins, and let the free enterprise system work.

There are a series of flashcards that have been made available by the USCIS, Citizenship Immigration Services. Those flashcards are little red things about like this. They will ask you a question when you study to be a naturalized American citizen.

On one side it will say, Who is the Father of our Country? Snap it over and it will say, George Washington.

Who saved the Union? Snap it over, Abe Lincoln.

What is the economic system of the United States? Snap it over, free enterprise capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that would be a question that would be answered accurately in the White House today, given the nationalization of one-third of the private-sector profits in the country, given the effort to nationalize our bodies.

Now, there is a concept, Mr. Speaker, that has some people raise their eyebrows. Now they are ready with their fingers on their keyboard, because they think that STEVE KING has said something that is completely outrageous. Well, it is completely thought through.

Here is the point. Ever since 1973, a significant percentage of Americans, albeit today in a minority, have continually made the argument that abortion should be available electively because no one has any business telling a woman what she can or can't do with her body. That is the argument.

The pro-choice crowd has continually argued you can't tell a woman what she can or can't do with her body. It is her body, a decision for her and for her doctor and for her pastor, priest, or rabbi. Funny that the father is not in this equation. But that is the argument; you can't tell a woman what she can or can't do with her body. It is a decision for her, her pastor, and her doctor.

Well, the same people, the same people that have been making that argu-

ment since 1973 that you can't tell a woman what she can or can't do with her body, it is her body, after all, are the ones that are now making the argument that the Federal Government should have the authority to tell everybody in America what we can or can't do with our body.

This is the nationalization of everybody's body. It is Uncle Sam taking over our bodies. The most private, personal thing we have is this physical body that we should be managing, taking care of, respecting, and be grateful and reverent for. And even in the legislation we see language that would tax your pop if it is not diet, or outlaw or tax trans fats, and try to manipulate behavior so that your body treats you in a fashion that is less of a demand on health care. This is the Federal Government telling us what we can and can't do with our body.

We have heard some talk about death panels, and I have not embellished that very much. But those panels would be a component of the thought process that I am discussing. You would have a Federal panel or committee that would be run by the Health Choices Administration czar who would determine when you could have tests, when you couldn't have tests; when a woman was too young for a mammogram, when a woman was too old for a mammogram, when she had had too many mammograms; tell you when you needed to be checked for colon cancer. They would put you through all these paces. It is the Federal Government managing our health care.

Why would we do that? Why would we give that up? Why would we let the Federal Government nationalize our bodies and decide what we will pay for health insurance premiums, what health insurance policies will be offered to us, and by those decisions they would decide then the cost of the premiums, the benefits of the premiums, from what would be offered. The Federal Government takeover of the most personal and private thing that we have, and in fact are, would be the nationalization of everybody's body in America.

Now, what does that mean? Well, it is we the people. The people get their rights from God. We take those rights and we confer them upon government and they derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

But if you look back at the old monarchies that were the precursors to this country, those subjects existed for the monarch, for the king. They were the king's subjects. He controlled them. He managed them for his own benefit at his own will. Some were benevolent and some were not. We have rejected the monarchy, and that is very clear if you read our Constitution.

But also the Communist state, where the individual exists for the benefit of the state and everybody's work and labor's for the benefit of the state. There isn't any system out there that respects and reveres the power of the individual and our individual rights that

come from God, and how people confer, the people, confer their powers that come from God and the consent of the governed, and pass it over to our elected representatives. That is the system that we have.

Why would the people of the United States of America give up their sovereign rights to control their own persons in spite of all the things that are in the Bill of Rights that define our individual rights? Why would we give that up and hand over the management of our health care to the Federal Government? Why would anybody propose such a thing?

I will submit, Mr. Speaker, they would only propose such a thing if they were anti-liberty, if they were anti-freedom, if they were pro-some other form of government that didn't respect the sovereignty of the individual and the God-given liberties that are invested in all of us. So, this is an important debate that is before us.

Tomorrow, President Obama will unveil, as he has announced, another series of bullet points. The last time it was 11 pages, no legislative language, of principles he thinks that we all should agree to. And he would give some opportunity for Republicans to accept a few more dictates, and he has indicated he would be interested in a couple of changes. But, in the end, they have created a toxic stew that started with that tainted old soupbone of HillaryCare of 15 years ago, and they have added bells and whistles to it that are designed to try to attract more people into this.

But if you start out with something toxic, whatever you add to it, it dilutes it, but it is still toxic. This is a toxic stew, this National Health Care Act. It needs to be thrown out, and we need to start fresh. Three out of four of the American people agree with me that we can't go forward with what we have in front of us. We have got to start all over again.

We need to start with tort reform and the lawsuit abuse, and allow people to really and truly and honestly and openly buy insurance across State lines. We need full deductibility of everybody's health insurance premiums. We need to expand Health Savings Accounts. We need to allow people to use HSAs. We need to set up a portability, so people can take their health insurance policies with them every time. And we need to address pre-existing conditions in a fashion that doesn't turn out to be socialized medicine.

All of that we can do, all of that we should do, but we should do it one bill at a time, standalone, very clear. Tort reform first; take this money out of the pockets of the trial lawyers, give it back to the ratepayers, and the taxpayers, and the patients. If we do that, that will be a powerful sign that this administration would finally be ready to work in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 2250

Until I see that, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that is the case. I think the effort is socialized medicine. I don't think it's about the liberty of America, nor do I believe it's about the efficiency and the quality of health care.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence, and I would yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and March 3 on account of business in her district.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of primary in district.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of family matters.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of Texas primary election.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of Texas primary.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HARPER, for 5 minutes, March 3.

Mr. PAULSEN, for 5 minutes, March 3.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 9.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 9.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, March 3 and 4.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, March 9.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 3 and 4.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CASSIDY, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1299. An act to make technical corrections to the laws affecting certain adminis-

trative authorities of the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4691. An act to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on February 26, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3961. An Act to extend expiring provisions of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 and Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 until February 28, 2011.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 3, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6312. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on progress toward compliance with destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions by the extended Chemical Weapons Convention deadline of April 29, 2012, and not later than December 31, 2017, pursuant to Public Law 110-116, section 8119; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6313. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Definitions of Component and Domestic Manufacture (DFARS Case 2005-D010) (RIN: 0750-AF22) received January 20, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6314. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Lead System Integrators (DFARS Case 2006-D051) (RIN: 0750-AF80) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6315. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Refinement of Income and Rent Determination Requirements in Public and Assisted Housing Programs: Implementation of the Enterprise Income Verification System — Amendments [Docket No.: FR-5351-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD48) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6316. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Exception to the Maturity Limit on Second Mortgages (RIN: 3133-AD64) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6317. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Display of Official Sign; Temporary Increase in Standard Maximum Share Insurance Amount; Coverage for Mortgage Servicing Accounts; Share Insurance for Revocable Trust Accounts (RIN: 3133-AD54; RIN: 3133-AD55) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6318. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Direct Investment Surveys: BE-605, Quarterly Survey of Foreign Direct Investment in the United States — Transactions of U.S. Affiliate With Foreign Parent [Docket No.: 090130108-91414-02] (RIN: 0691-AA70) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6319. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 20-09 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6320. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No. 04-10 informing of an intent to sign a Project Agreement with North Atlantic Treaty Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6321. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6322. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6323. A letter from the Executive Director, Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation, transmitting pursuant to the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act, the Foundation's General/Trust Fund Financial Statements for the First Quarter of FY 2010 ended December 31, 2009, as prepared by the U.S. General Services Administration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6324. A letter from the Director, U.S. Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Suspension of the Population Estimates and Income Estimates Challenge Programs [Docket Number: 0908171239-91412-02] (RIN: 0607-AA49) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6325. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer/President, Financing Corporation, transmitting a copy of the Financing Corporation's Statement on the System of Internal Controls and the 2009 Audited Financial Statements; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6326. A letter from the Branch Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Changes in the Regulations Governing Falconry [FWS-R9-MB-2009-0002; 91200-1231-9BPP] (RIN: 1018-AW44) received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for Subsurface Safety Valve Equipment [Docket ID: MMS-2007-OMM-0066] (RIN: 1010-AD45) received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6328. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Endangered Species, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To List the Galapagos Petrel and Heinroth's Shearwater as Threatened Throughout Their Ranges [FWS-R9-ES-2009-0086; 90100-1660-1FLA] (RIN: 1018-AW70) received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6329. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2010 Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Specifications; Preliminary 2010 Quota Adjustments; 2010 Summer Flounder Quota for Delaware [Docket No.: 0908191244-91427-02] (RIN: 0648-XR08) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6330. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 090130102-91386-02] (RIN: 0648-XT01) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6331. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure [Docket No.: 0812171612-9134-02] (RIN: 0648-XT31) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6332. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Pacific Whiting Allocation; Pacific Whiting Seasons [Docket No.: 090428799-9802-01] (RIN: 0648-XT30) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6333. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Adminis-

tration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States [Docket No.: 0909011267-91427-02] (RIN: 0648-AY19) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6334. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 0809251266-81485-02] (RIN: 0648-XT39) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6335. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2010 Bering Sea Pollock Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XT40) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6336. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2010 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amount [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XT41) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6337. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2010 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 0910091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XT52) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6338. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Hailbut Fisheries; Limited Access for Guided Sport Charter Vessels in Alaska [Docket No.: 080630798-91430-02] (RIN: 0648-AW92) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6339. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employment & Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Agricultural Employment of H-2A Aliens in the United States (RIN: 1205-AB55) received November 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6340. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employment & Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Employment of H-2A Aliens in the United States (RIN: 1205-AB55) received November 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6341. A letter from the Clerk of Court, United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit No. 08-3642 — Ortega v. Holder (January 15, 2010); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6342. A letter from the Assistant CC for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision to Requirements for the Transportation of Batteries and Battery-Powered Devices; and Harmonization With the United Nations Recommendations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and International Civil Aviation Organization's Technical Instructions; Correction [Docket No.: PHMSA-2007-0065 (HM0224D) and PHMSA-2008-0005 (HM-215J)] (RIN: 2137-AB54) received January 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6343. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, NIST, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Precision Measurement Grants Program; Availability of Funds [Docket Number: 0911251416-91417-01] received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

6344. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program — Basic Entitlement; Effective Date of Induction Into a Rehabilitation Program; Cooperation in Initial Evaluation (RIN: 2900-AN13) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6345. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program — Self-Employment (RIN: 2900-AN31) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6346. A letter from the Director of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program — Periods of Eligibility (RIN: 2900-AM84) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6347. A letter from the Grants Management Officer, DHS Office of Grants Policy & Oversight, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of Homeland Security Implementation of OMB Guidance on Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension [Docket No.: DHS-2007-0006] (RIN: 1601-AA46) received January 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

6348. A letter from the Acting Director, Infrastructure Security Compliance Division, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Appendix to Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards [DHS-2006-0073] (RIN: 1601-AA41) received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

6349. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Demonstration of Coverage of Chiropractic Services under Medicare; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6350. A letter from the Acting Assistant Director, Directives and Regulations Branch, ORMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning (RIN: 0596-AB86) received January 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

6351. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on

FEMA-1863-DR for the State of Louisiana; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1126. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4247) to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint and seclusion in schools, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-425). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Transportation Safety Board for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 4715. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 4716. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Colorado, except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 4717. A bill to require the Attorney General of the United States to compile, and make publically available, certain data relating to the Equal Access to Justice Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BONO MACK:

H.R. 4718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the taxation of unemployment compensation for 3 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 4719. A bill to establish a Southwest Border Region Water Task Force; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 4720. A bill to provide for a 5 percent reduction in the rates of basic pay for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 4721. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Flanders, New York; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 4722. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out an active transportation investment program to encourage a mode shift to active transportation within selected communities by providing safe and convenient options to bicycle and walk for routine travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOYD:

H.R. 4723. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to study the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery and to limit the authority of the Secretary to promulgate any interim rules for the fishery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4724. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit the conversion of leadership PAC funds to personal use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4725. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the Army Corps of Engineers of the hurricane barrier for the city of New Bedford, Massachusetts and the town of Fairhaven, Massachusetts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4726. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects to encourage the design, planning, and construction of the North Los Angeles County Regional Water Recycling Project in the State of California; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NADLER of New York (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to place limitations on the possession, sale, and other disposition of a firearm by persons convicted of misdemeanor sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. INGLIS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MASSA):

H.R. 4728. A bill to authorize assistance to promote counter-extremism efforts in the Balkan region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4729. A bill to clarify the situations in which a corporation may be treated as a person under Federal law; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHAUER:

H.R. 4730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a refundable credit for increasing employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 4731. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure access to resin-based dental fillings that, at a minimum, is equal to the level of access to mercury-based dental fillings under such title; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 4732. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to create a

new conditional approval system for drugs, biological products, and devices that is responsive to the needs of seriously ill patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATSON (for herself and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 4733. A bill to promote the well-being of farm animals by requiring Federal agencies to procure food products derived from certain animals only from sources that raised the animals free from cruelty and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 4734. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to provide children from underserved areas with better access to meals served through the summer food service program for children and certain child care programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the endangerment finding and the cause or contribute findings for greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOYD, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARROW, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. NYE, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. COSTA):

H.J. Res. 78. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of March 20 as a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mr. HOLT):

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution recognizing the life-saving role of ostomy care and prosthetics in the daily lives of hundreds of thousands of people in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERRIELLO (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HARE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIRE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 1125. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Works Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H. Res. 1127. A resolution expressing concern regarding the suicide plane attack on Internal Revenue Service employees in Austin, Texas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HARE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. FARR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CHU,

Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. OLSON, Mr. JONES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 1128. A resolution thanking Vancouver for hosting the world during the 2010 Winter Olympics and honoring the athletes from Team USA; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H. Res. 1129. A resolution expressing the sense of the House that the Secretary of the Treasury should direct the United States Executive Directors to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose making any loans to the Government of Antigua and Barbuda until that Government cooperates with the United States and compensates the victims of the Stanford Financial Group fraud; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NUNES):

H. Res. 1130. A resolution expressing support for the people affected by the natural disasters on Madeira Island; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H. Res. 1131. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of April 18, 2010, through April 23, 2010, as National Assistant Principals Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H. Res. 1132. A resolution honoring the USS New Mexico as the sixth Virginia-class submarine commissioned by the U.S. Navy to protect and defend the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FUDGE, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BARROW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HARE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. KISSELL):

H. Res. 1133. A resolution recognizing the extraordinary number of African-Americans who have overcome significant obstacles to enhance innovation and competitiveness in the field of science in the United States; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 1134. A resolution mourning the loss of Vernon Hunter and honoring the service of Robin De Haven and the first responders to the attack on the Internal Revenue Service in Austin, Texas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 55: Mr. HINCHAY.
H.R. 208: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 227: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 272: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 297: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 412: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 417: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 442: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 450: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 537: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 557: Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 572: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 658: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 667: Mr. OWENS and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 673: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 675: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 690: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 734: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MITCHELL, and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 795: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 832: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 919: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 946: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 949: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 994: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 1039: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 1074: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1083: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
 H.R. 1085: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 1137: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1175: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1177: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 1203: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 1204: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 1205: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1208: Mr. PITTS and Mr. LEE of New York.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 1283: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 1305: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
 H.R. 1314: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1340: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 1409: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1526: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1547: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1552: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
 H.R. 1618: Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 1670: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1681: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1775: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1778: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. TAYLOR.
 H.R. 1806: Mr. ISRAEL and Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H.R. 1826: Ms. KILROY.
 H.R. 1836: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 1844: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. WU, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2006: Mr. SCHAUER.
 H.R. 2030: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2085: Mr. KANJORSKI.
 H.R. 2112: Mr. LEE of New York.
 H.R. 2149: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2159: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2160: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. HILL and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 2324: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 2377: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 2378: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 2382: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 2478: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2555: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 2565: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 2567: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2754: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2782: Mr. HEINRICH.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 2824: Mr. LEE of New York.
 H.R. 2842: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 2859: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 2891: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2969: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 2976: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 3048: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3070: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 3116: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 3178: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 3415: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. OBEY.
 H.R. 3488: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H.R. 3502: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 3526: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3586: Mrs. SCHMIDT.
 H.R. 3656: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 3657: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 3721: Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 3758: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 3764: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 3765: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3790: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. NUNES.
 H.R. 3813: Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 3943: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3990: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 4001: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 4028: Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 4036: Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 4091: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 4109: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4128: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 4149: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4189: Mr. HELLER.
 H.R. 4190: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 4196: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 4197: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 4202: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 4203: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 4241: Ms. TITUS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. COOPER.
 H.R. 4255: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 4274: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4278: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H.R. 4301: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 4309: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 4321: Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 4329: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 4343: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 4386: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 4400: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 4404: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 4405: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 4413: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 4420: Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 4446: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4465: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4477: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 4488: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 4497: Mr. KISSELL, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4509: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4529: Mr. PAULSEN and Mr. INGLIS.
 H.R. 4530: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 4537: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4541: Mr. OWENS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4545: Mr. PERRIELLO and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 4551: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 4554: Mr. KAGEN.
 H.R. 4557: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4564: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WATT, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LOEBACK, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4572: Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 4573: Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4601: Mr. WU, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4616: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 4629: Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 4630: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 4638: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4640: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 4647: Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. TANNER.
 H.R. 4648: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. BOEHNER.
 H.R. 4649: Mr. SHULER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 4662: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 4674: Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 4678: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 4684: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 4690: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 4692: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. KISSELL.
 H.R. 4693: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 4700: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HARE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 H.R. 4705: Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 4710: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.J. Res. 43: Mr. MACK.
 H.J. Res. 74: Mr. WELCH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.J. Res. 76: Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. BRIGHT.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 362: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H. Res. 615: Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H. Res. 699: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. SNYDER.
 H. Res. 704: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIRK, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 747: Mr. SNYDER.
 H. Res. 764: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
 H. Res. 812: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H. Res. 925: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H. Res. 936: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H. Res. 947: Mr. FILNER.
 H. Res. 989: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 1026: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H. Res. 1055: Mr. NYE and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 1063: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 1078: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. COBLE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H. Res. 1079: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1086: Mrs. BONO MACK.

H. Res. 1091: Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 1096: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 1097: Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. FOSTER.

H. Res. 1102: Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 1111: Mr. GERLACH.

H. Res. 1116: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WALDEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KILROY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 1120: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 1122: Mr. STEARNS.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER of California, or a designee, to H.R. 4247, the Preventing Harmful Restraint and Seclusion in Schools Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.